

# *Aquatic invertebrate communities in tank bromeliads: how well do classic ecological patterns apply?*

**M. Jocque & R. Field**


## **Hydrobiologia**

The International Journal of Aquatic Sciences

ISSN 0018-8158

Hydrobiologia

DOI 10.1007/s10750-014-1831-7



**Your article is protected by copyright and all rights are held exclusively by Springer International Publishing Switzerland. This e-offprint is for personal use only and shall not be self-archived in electronic repositories. If you wish to self-archive your article, please use the accepted manuscript version for posting on your own website. You may further deposit the accepted manuscript version in any repository, provided it is only made publicly available 12 months after official publication or later and provided acknowledgement is given to the original source of publication and a link is inserted to the published article on Springer's website. The link must be accompanied by the following text: "The final publication is available at [link.springer.com](http://link.springer.com)".**

# Aquatic invertebrate communities in tank bromeliads: how well do classic ecological patterns apply?

M. Jocque · R. Field

Received: 3 May 2013 / Revised: 7 February 2014 / Accepted: 11 February 2014  
© Springer International Publishing Switzerland 2014

**Abstract** Tank bromeliads (Bromeliaceae) often occur in high densities in the Neotropics and represent a key freshwater habitat in montane forests, housing quite complex invertebrate communities. We tested the extent to which there are species richness–altitude, richness–environment, richness–size, richness–habitat complexity and richness–isolation relationships for the aquatic invertebrate communities from 157 bromeliads in Cusuco National Park, Honduras. We found that invertebrate species richness and abundance correlated most strongly, and positively, with habitat size, which accounted for about a third of the variance in both. Apart from bromeliad size (equivalent of the species–area relationship), we found remarkably little evidence of classic biogeographic and ecological relationships

with species richness in this system. Community composition correlated with altitude, bromeliad size and position, though less than 20% of the variation was accounted for by the tested variables. The turnover component of dissimilarity between the communities correlated with altitude, while the nestedness-resultant component was related to bromeliad size. The unexplained variance could reflect a large stochastic component in the system, associated with the ephemerality of the habitat patches (both the plants themselves and the fluctuations in their water content) and stochasticity due to the dispersal dynamics in the system. We conclude that there is a small contribution of classic biogeographic factors to the diversity and community composition of aquatic invertebrates communities in bromeliads. This may be due to the highly dynamic nature of this system, with small patch sizes and high emigration rates. The patterns may mostly be driven by factors affecting colonisation success.

**Keywords** Alpha diversity · Altitudinal gradient · Beta diversity · Species diversity · Species–elevation relationship · Species–isolation relationship

Handling editor: B. Oertli

M. Jocque (✉)  
Koninklijk Belgisch Instituut voor Natuurwetenschappen  
(KBIN), Vautierstraat 29, 1000 Brussels, Belgium  
e-mail: merlijn.jocque@gmail.com

M. Jocque  
Jessica Ware Lab, Rutgers, The State University of New  
Jersey, 195 University Avenue, Newark, NJ 07102, USA

M. Jocque  
Operation Wallacea, Hope House, Old Bolingbroke,  
Lincolnshire, UK

R. Field  
School of Geography, University of Nottingham,  
University Park, Nottingham NG7 2RD, UK

## Introduction

Bromeliads (Bromeliaceae) are a characteristic component of Neotropical forests. Found from ground level to high in the canopy, they contribute significantly to

the habitat complexity (Benzing, 2000), in particular for invertebrates. Bromeliads in a large subset of the family, called tank bromeliads, are capable of holding considerable quantities of water in their leaf axils, creating aquatic habitats that are inhabited by aquatic invertebrate communities (Fish, 1976; Greeney, 2001; Frank & Lounibos, 2009). Tank bromeliads can occur in high densities, and, based on their three-dimensional distribution in forests, may be the phytotelm (plant-held water body) habitat occurring in the highest densities anywhere. For example, Sugden & Robins (1979) recorded a mean density of 17.5 plants/m<sup>2</sup> of ground area in a cloud forest in Colombia. If the volume of water retained per plant is on average of the order of 100 cm<sup>3</sup> (the average for the bromeliads in our data), then such densities translate into tens of thousands of litres of water available for colonisation by aquatic animals, per hectare. In the absence of other lentic water bodies, as is often the case in mountainous tropical forest areas, phytotelm habitats provide an important freshwater habitat. The profusion of bromeliads, and their use as breeding habitats by vectors for human diseases such as malaria and dengue, render bromeliads important from a range of perspectives. In addition, bromeliads represent self-contained aquatic communities for the aquatic stages of invertebrates, present naturally and at high replication, making them potentially valuable as a study system for tackling prominent ecological and evolutionary questions (Srivastava et al., 2004). Well-defined aquatic communities occurring in clusters are highly suitable for studying metacommunity dynamics (Leibold et al., 2004). Further, bromeliads can be effectively imitated by artificial containers (Srivastava, 2006). These features allow easy manipulation and great flexibility in research design.

Despite the great advantages conferred by tank bromeliads, knowledge of their aquatic invertebrate communities, and what structures them, remains limited—even though research on aquatic invertebrates in phytotelmata dates back at least to 1915 (Picado, 1913; see also Laessle, 1961; Maguire, 1971; Frank & Lounibos, 1983; Kitching, 2000). Most studies on aquatic invertebrates in bromeliads to date have focused on cataloguing species not previously known in phytotelmata (e.g. Mendes et al., 2011). Recently, however, ecological studies have started to contribute to the understanding of this habitat (e.g. Armbruster et al., 2002; Jabiol et al., 2009; Brouard et al., 2011).

The highly dynamic nature of the system (the plants have limited life spans and there can be considerable drying and wetting), and the wide environmental range in which bromeliads are found, mean a lot of variability. This variability offers considerable opportunities but also complicates the study of (invertebrate) community-structuring mechanisms. Additionally, the mixing of terrestrial and (semi-)aquatic components of invertebrate communities hampers straightforward interpretation of results. Earlier ecological bromeliad invertebrate studies included both terrestrial and aquatic species, analysing them as single communities (e.g. Cotgreave et al., 1993). Although terrestrial–aquatic links are present (Cereghino et al., 2011), the two components are structured differently and should ideally be analysed separately if both groups are included in the study. Tank bromeliads represent discrete habitat units for aquatic invertebrates, but less so for most terrestrial invertebrates. A large proportion of the terrestrial invertebrates found in bromeliads comprises occasional vagrants, increasing noise in analyses. Also, the very high diversity of terrestrial invertebrates in tropical forests presents formidable challenges in terms of identification, typically pushing the taxonomic resolution to ecologically less interesting levels such as that of the family. Ecological studies aiming to unravel community structuring should take these differences into consideration, and for all of these reasons, we restrict our analyses herein to aquatic invertebrates.

Bromeliads can be seen as islands of aquatic habitat in a forest matrix and results from recent studies indicate that these communities fit with at least one well-established biogeographic pattern for islands: the species (richness)–area relationship. Jabiol et al. (2009) found that aquatic insect richness and abundance were positively associated with water volume, a proxy for island/habitat size. In studies considering both terrestrial and aquatic invertebrate communities, positive correlations between invertebrate species richness and bromeliad size have been observed (Armbruster et al., 2002; Montero et al., 2010). Apart from this, little is known about the extent to which aquatic invertebrates in bromeliads follow classic island biogeographic patterns, such as the species–isolation and species–altitude relationships. Altitude, for example, is known to affect species richness in a wide range of taxa and habitats globally (Rahbek, 1995; McCain, 2007). Further, the extent to which these aquatic bromeliad communities are structured

according to classic ecological and biogeographic rules remains fragmentarily evaluated: environment (often measured as productivity; Field et al., 2009) and habitat complexity (Hortal et al., 2009) are also factors affecting species richness in many taxa around the world. For bromeliad invertebrate communities, some studies point towards the importance of light and organic material (a proxy for productivity; Srivastava et al., 2008) in influencing community assembly (e.g. Dézerald et al., 2014). Habitat complexity, measured as the number of leaves, may affect the invertebrate system, as judged by results combining terrestrial and aquatic components (Armbruster et al., 2002).

Much island biogeography theory, including the classic ‘equilibrium theory of island biogeography’ (ETIB, MacArthur & Wilson, 1967), is based on the idea that species richness on an island (whether a true island or a habitat island) is the result of a dynamic equilibrium between influx and local loss of organisms. Influx includes both colonisation from an external source pool and local addition through speciation. Loss of species may result from both emigration of individuals and the deaths of individuals culminating in local extinction. The ETIB focuses on immigration and local extinction, and not speciation (which we do not consider relevant for our dataset, and do not consider further) or emigration. It also assumes some dispersal limitation from the source pool to the island. Bromeliads, although easily recognised as insular habitat patches, may have a differing relative importance of processes to those that underlie the ETIB and related theories. During the aquatic phase of the invertebrates’ life-cycles, dispersal limitation is likely to be very strong, especially for the active dispersers, many of which actively avoid leaving the bromeliads at this stage. However, once they have emerged as flying insects, the distances between bromeliads may present almost no barrier to dispersal; instead, limitation may be mainly due to their ability to locate suitable habitat, and this may favour colonisation of large bromeliads and those in clusters. In terms of species loss, although competition may play a role, we consider predation (particularly for passive dispersers) and emigration (particularly for active dispersers) to be far more important. It is of interest to ask whether both the different colonisation dynamics and the substitution of emigration and predation for demographic extinction are associated with similar biogeographic patterns to

those associated with islands more closely matching the assumptions of the ETIB.

A long-term, time-series dataset would be ideal for analysing the processes associated with influx and loss of species in bromeliads. However, investigating patterns of community composition should yield interesting results that are informative about community assembly. For example, the separation of species replacement (turnover) and species loss without replacement (nestedness) when comparing communities, gives insight into community-structuring factors (Baselga, 2010). Nestedness of species assemblages—when the lists of species in species-poor communities are subsets of those in species-rich communities—reflects a non-random limitation of species in a community, which could be driven by habitat size or colonisation limitation. Spatial turnover—the replacement of some species by others through space—could result from environmental sorting or dispersal constraints. More generally, examining altitudinal and environmental relationships addresses key aspects of biodiversity patterning (Rohde, 1992), reflecting the fact that bromeliads represent independent replicates of aquatic invertebrate communities.

We investigate classic ecological and biogeographic relationships for a large sample of naturally occurring bromeliad aquatic invertebrate communities in montane tropical forest, including cloud forest, in Honduras. We test the following specific predictions. (1) Larger bromeliads are occupied by more species (equivalent to the species–area relationship). (2) More isolated bromeliads (from other bromeliads) contain fewer species (species–isolation relationship). (3) Bromeliads with more leaves contain more species (habitat heterogeneity hypothesis). (4) There is a positive relationship between detritus content (productivity hypothesis) and species richness. (5) There is a negative relationship between altitude and species richness. In addition, we analyse ecological community structuring parameters in a metacommunity setting, again in relation to size, isolation, altitude, habitat complexity and environmental variables. To gain a better insight into the processes underlying tank bromeliad metacommunity patterns and test how well these communities follow island biogeographic patterns, we include an analysis of the dissimilarity between the component communities (beta diversity), partitioning it into turnover and nestedness-resultant components (Baselga, 2010).

## Materials and methods

### Field site

The bromeliad sampling took place from June to August 2006 and 2007 in Cusuco National Park (CNP), situated in the Merendon Mountain range in north-western Honduras. The core zone of the park consists of lower montane tropical rain forest (a mix of primary and secondary), with patches of primary cloud forest and upper montane rain forest characterised by high densities of bromeliads. We collected 157 bromeliads from five main sampling areas (centred on the field camps 'Base Camp', 'El Cortecito', 'Guanales', 'El Danto' and 'Cantiles'). For a detailed description of the area and permanent sampling lines, see Field & Long (2007).

### Sampling protocol

In order to minimise the influences of physical structure and possible biochemical differences between species, we only sampled individuals of *Tillandsia guatemalensis* Smith. This is one of the more abundant bromeliad species in CNP, with enough water to accommodate aquatic invertebrate communities. We sampled invertebrate communities completely, by dismantling each bromeliad, leaf by leaf. For a fuller description of the sampling protocol, including the randomization procedure, see Jocque et al. (2010a). We only sampled bromeliads large enough to contain water, which translated into minimum leaf spread of 18 cm, all but four being 20 cm or larger.

Before sampling each bromeliad, we recorded a range of environmental variables: altitude ('altitude', in metres above sea level), attachment height on the tree ('attach'), the width ('width') and height ('height') of the bromeliad, the number of other bromeliads within a 2-m radius ('R-Brom'), the amount of light ('light', openness of the canopy, ten-point scale) and the openness to receive water from precipitation ('rain', effectively an inverse shelter measure, ten-point scale). The attachment height on the tree was measured as the shortest distance in cm between the forest floor and the underside of the bromeliad core. The bromeliad core is the central axis where all leaf bases join, and is also the origin of the roots (or 'holdfasts' because they are only used for attachment). For plant width and height, we measured

from the point of water catchment on the leaves: leaves are angled upwards from the core of the plant until they (particularly outer leaves) bend downwards from the weight of the leaf. Up to this point of bending downwards, the water intercepted by the leaves runs into the leaf axils; beyond that point most water does not run into the tank of the bromeliad. We measured the width of the plant as the largest horizontal distance between the water catchments points of two opposing leaves (cm). We measured the height of the plant from the base of the bromeliad core to the highest water catchment point (cm). We counted the number of other bromeliads on the same tree as the sampled bromeliad, and also on the trees within a 2-m radius. In 2007, we additionally stratified sampling of bromeliads, into two types: individuals that were the only bromeliad attached to the tree (SOLO) and individuals that were one of at least two bromeliads attached to the same tree (MULTI). In MULTI, we targeted bromeliads that were underneath others on the tree, thus allowing dispersal into them via water flow from other bromeliads. This was mostly geared towards the dispersal of the passive dispersers (Ostracoda and Anomopoda).

After the measurement of these variables in the field, we placed each sampled bromeliad in a bucket and transported it to the nearest camp for immediate processing. We collected the water contained and then took the plant apart, leaf by leaf, rinsing every leaf with 64- $\mu$ m filtered river water. During this process, we measured additional variables: amount of water held by the plant (ml), the total number of leaves, fresh weight of the cleaned plant (g) and circumference of the core (mm). The total number of leaves comprised all the green leaves and the leaves with at least the base still green. All washed parts of the plant were weighed with a 500 g Pesola spring meter, once excess water had been removed. We measured the circumference (mm) of the bromeliad core after removing the leaves. Animals were picked out alive from the rinsing water, and fixated in 70% ethanol. After removing all the invertebrates, we manually removed the larger organic debris and then filtered the rest using a 22- $\mu$ m sieve, to determine detritus content (g). We processed the invertebrates in a laboratory using an OLYMPUS SZX-12 stereomicroscope and identified all to morphospecies; full species identification (and description, in some cases, e.g. Mendes et al., 2011) is ongoing and gives us confidence in the matching of our morphospecies to known species.

## Statistical analyses

To test predictions 1–5, we first examined linear correlations between all variables. When needed to remove skew and normalise the errors associated with best-fit lines, we either square root or log-transformed variables for further analysis. We used regression to determine the individual contributions of the recorded variables relevant to predictions 1–5, in accounting for the variation in both richness and total abundance. To assess whether any improvement could be made on the simple model for species richness resulting from this exploratory analysis, we used multi-model inference. This ran 16,383 regression models, comparing all against each other using Akaike's Information Criterion (AICc). Many of the potential explanatory variables were highly collinear, particularly measures of bromeliad size and measures of bromeliad position. We therefore ran principal components analyses (correlation method) of these two groups of variables, to create two orthogonal principal components of each phenomenon; in doing so, we square root-transformed most of the variables, to reduce or remove skew.

Complementary to the correlations with richness and abundance to test predictions 1–5, we analysed community composition using both ordination and analysis of beta diversity. In ordination, the choice of linear or unimodal analysis methods is traditionally based on the amount of variation present in the dataset, reflected as the length of the environmental gradient. Because the environmental gradient in our dataset was less than four, we opted for the linear response (ter Braak & Šmilauer, 2002). We used the linear direct analysis (RDA) with forward selection based on 999 Monte Carlo permutations to build a model. We square root-transformed the abundance data to reduce the impact of high abundances. We standardised species abundances (dividing them by the standard deviation of values) to focus on community composition. We also removed rare species (defined as only 1 or 2 individuals in the total dataset) from the analysis; these were three beetle species, a chironomid, a culicid, two Diptera and a copepod species. We included all the measured variables in the initial analyses and, using a forward selection procedure, isolated the factors accounting for the most variance in the dataset.

When examining for possible effects of altitude (prediction 5), as well as correlating diversity with the continuous altitude data, we looked for patterns in

diversity in altitude categories. The altitudinal range was from 1,347 to 2,084 m, but samples were not equally spread over all altitudes. We used four categories: <1,500; 1,500–1,600; 1,600–1,900; and >1,900. Based on the lowest number of bromeliads sampled in a category (18 below 1,500 m), we reduced all the other groups to 20 bromeliads, selecting bromeliads randomly. We then used Kruskal–Wallis tests to test for any differences between the altitudinal categories, for Shannon, Simpson and Margalef diversity, average species richness, dominance Index, evenness and total richness.

To gain insight into the underlying metacommunity-structuring processes, we partitioned beta diversity following the method of Baselga (2010). Splitting overall beta diversity into its (spatial) turnover and nestedness components allows the identification of species replacement or species loss, respectively, as driving factors in community assembly (Baselga, 2010). We used the 'betapart' package in R. This calculates the pairwise Sorensen dissimilarities between all the bromeliad communities (overall dissimilarity or 'beta diversity'), and partitions that into its turnover (Simpson dissimilarity) and nestedness-resultant components. The part of the Sorensen dissimilarity that is due to nestedness rather than turnover is simply the difference between the Sorensen and Simpson dissimilarity measures. We repeated this analysis using Jaccard dissimilarity measures, but because both gave qualitatively identical results in all cases, we focus mainly on the Sorensen–Simpson method. We thus obtained a series of six distance matrices (of pairwise dissimilarities: Sorensen, Simpson, nestedness (Sorensen minus Simpson), Jaccard, Jaccard turnover, Jaccard nestedness), each of which we then correlated with a matrix of geographic distances between the bromeliads, using Mantel tests in the R package 'vegan', with 999 permutations to determine significance. We repeated this for other types of environmental distance, focusing on correlating the six sets of community dissimilarities with pairwise differences in altitude, bromeliad size and bromeliad position.

For statistical analyses, we used R (R Studio, Inc. 2012), STATISTICA (StatSoft, Inc., 2012) and SAM (Spatial Analysis in Macroecology, Rangel et al., 2006).

## Results

For this study, we recognised 42 (morpho)species (Table 1). Ongoing determinations have resulted in a

more conservative identification of the recognised morphospecies, with reductions of the numbers of species in the Chironomidae (2), Tipulidae (2), Culicidae (5), Syrphidae (4) and the additions of a Psychodidae species and a copepod, compared to a previous study on the same bromeliads (Jocque et al., 2010a).

The correlation matrix of the measured variables (Table 2) suggests no correlation between species richness or total invertebrate abundance and detritus content (refuting prediction 4), altitude (refuting prediction 5), attachment height or the number of nearby bromeliads (inconsistent with prediction 2). It also indicates two blocks of correlated explanatory variables. The first is all factors associated with phytotelm size and complexity: weight, width, height, core diameter, water content, detritus content and number of leaves. Weight was by far the strongest correlate ( $r = 0.95$ ) of the first axis of the principal components analysis of these variables, this axis accounting for 62% of the variation in the data. The

second block of correlated variables includes factors associated with the positioning of the bromeliad in the environment: the openness to light and rainfall and the number of other bromeliads nearby (Table 2). From the positional variables in the second group, the estimated exposure to light and rainfall were the only variables correlating significantly with species richness, but each only accounted for 4% of the variance in species richness.

Of all the putative explanatory variables, the total fresh weight of the leaves ('weight') correlated most strongly with both species richness and the total number of individuals (abundance) in the bromeliads (Table 2). This supports prediction 1. Log-transformed weight accounted for slightly more of the variation in richness ( $r = 0.58$ ,  $r^2 = 0.33$ ) than the untransformed (Fig. 1). In a partial regression using log (weight) and the number of leaves as explanatory variables, while 11% of the variation in species richness was accounted for uniquely by bromeliad weight, only 0.4% was uniquely accounted for by the number of leaves and this

**Table 1** Number of unidentified morphospecies recorded in the sampled bromeliads

Class	Family	Genus	Species	No. of spp.
Diptera				6
	Chironomidae			5
	Ceratopogonidae	<i>Bezzia</i>		3
	Tipulidae	<i>Trentepohlia</i>		1
	Culicidae	<i>Culex</i>		1
	Culicidae	<i>Aedes</i>		2
	Culicidae	<i>Toxorhynchites</i>		1
	Culicidae	<i>Wyeomia</i>		1
	Syrphidae	<i>Ocyptamus</i>		1
	Syrphidae	<i>Copestylum</i>		4
	Syrphidae	<i>Meromacrus</i>		1
	Psychodidae	<i>Telmatoscopus</i>		2
Coleoptera				5
	Scirtidae	<i>Scirtes</i>		1
Hemiptera	Mesoveliidae			1
Ostracoda	Limnocytheridae	<i>Elpidium</i>		1
	Candonidae			1
Branchiopoda	Daphniidae	<i>Ceriodaphnia</i>	<i>laticaudata</i>	1
	Chydoridae	<i>Alona</i>	<i>bromelicola</i>	1
Copepoda				1
Oligochaeta	Enchytraeidae	<i>Hemienchytraeus</i>		1
Turbellaria				1
Total				42


**Table 2** Correlation matrix of the explanatory variables, the species richness (S) and total Abundance (Abund) of invertebrates recorded in the sampled bromeliads

	Width	Height	Core	Water	Weight	# leaves	Detritus	Attach	Light	Rain	R-Brom	S	Abund
Altitude	-0.26**	-0.26**	0.15	0.11	-0.11	-0.14	-0.07	-0.02	-0.26**	-0.15	-0.07	-0.1	-0.13
Width		0.55***	0.55***	0.45***	0.80***	0.63***	0.70***	0.11	0.18*	0.20*	0.15	0.48***	0.45***
Height			0.31***	0.18*	0.40***	0.30***	0.46***	0.01	0.37***	0.42***	0.28***	0.26**	0.33***
Core				0.39***	0.69***	0.47***	0.52***	0.16*	0.1	0.18*	0.11	0.42***	0.47***
Water					0.61***	0.52***	0.25**	0.05	-0.04	0.05	0.03	0.35***	0.32***
Weight						0.74***	0.74***	0.15	0.14	0.15	0.09	0.54***	0.49***
# leaves							0.54***	0.11	0.14	0.13	0.08	0.47***	0.32***
Detritus								0.09	0.08	0.14	0.11	0.45***	0.34***
Attach									-0.01	-0.07	-0.07	-0.01	-0.02
Light										0.83***	0.51***	0.19*	0.25**
Rain											0.62***	0.20*	0.31***
R-Brom												0.06	0.08
S													0.62***

	Width (cm)	Height (cm)	Core (mm)	Water (ml)	Weight (g)	# leaves	Detritus (g)	Attach (mm)	Light	Rain	R-Brom	S	Abund
Mean	37.3	12.8	8.8	83.3	174.0	26	28.2	140.1	4.1	3.2	13.0	8.0	55.8
Stdev	12.8	8.3	3.0	85.1	132.5	8	24.5	60.0	2.0	2.7	18.0	3.2	46.6
Max	84	52	27.5	410	613	49	130	369	8	9	114	17	227
Min	17	0	3.5	1	9	11	1	30	1	0	0	1	4


Values shown are Pearson's  $r$  for untransformed variables. Significance is indicated as \*  $0.05 > P > 0.01$ , \*\*  $0.01 > P > 0.001$ , \*\*\*  $P < 0.001$ . Width, height and core (diameter of) all measure physical bromeliad size. Water content, weight (fresh weight of leaves), number of leaves and detritus content are also related to bromeliad size. Attachment height, access to light and rainfall, and the total number of bromeliads within a radius of 2 m (R-Brom) all quantify position in the forest canopy. The number of invertebrate species (S) and the total number of invertebrates (Abund) per bromeliad are response variables. Mean values with standard deviation (Stdev) and the maximum and minimum recorded values of each variable are presented at the lower part of the table



**Fig. 1** Scatter plot of species richness and total wet weight of the washed bromeliad leaves in grams. The correlation is significant and a semi-logarithmic fit is displayed (species richness =  $-1.66 + 4.65 * \log(\text{weight})$ ), which accounts for 33% of the variance in species richness

contribution was not significant; shared explained variance was 22%. Very similar results were obtained when analysing total abundance of invertebrates, rather than species richness. This is inconsistent with prediction 3. The correlation between species richness and  $\log(\text{weight})$  was also stronger than that between species richness and the first axis from the principal components analysis on all the size variables. Further, no combination of explanatory variables improved on  $\log(\text{weight})$  alone, in accounting for variation in species richness, as judged by AICc in multi-model inference. This supports prediction 1 and is inconsistent with predictions 2–5.

A large number of recorded environmental variables together accounted for a relatively small proportion of the community composition in our dataset. The forward selection of the linear redundancy analyses (RDA) isolated altitude, water, number of leaves, total weight of the bromeliad, exposure to precipitation, the total number of bromeliads, detritus content and attachment height of the bromeliads as the strongest explanatory variables (Fig. 2), in total accounting for 20% variation of the dataset (sum of all canonical eigenvalues = 0.200,  $F = 4.563$ ,  $P = 0.001$ ). In the biplot of species and environmental variables, three groups of variables can be distinguished, with particular species associated with them (Fig. 2). One comprises variables measuring the size and complexity of the bromeliad habitat (number of leaves, detritus content, plant weight and the water content). Most of the species associated with variation in these variables



**Fig. 2** RDA biplot of the species and environmental variables. See Table 1 for a list of the species and Table 2 for explanation of the variable names

are Diptera. The second group contains two position variables: attachment height of the bromeliad on the tree and the exposure to rainfall. Most strongly associated with these variables are passive dispersers (the two ostracod species and the two water fleas). The final group is only altitude, which is most associated with several species of Diptera.

The results of the beta diversity partitioning are shown in Table 3 and nicely complement the ordinations. The dissimilarity in species composition between bromeliads was positively correlated with both the difference in altitude and the difference in size between bromeliads. It was the turnover component that correlated with altitude and the nestedness-resultant component that correlated with bromeliad size. Thus, invertebrate species tended to replace each other along the altitudinal gradient, while dissimilarity related to bromeliad size was due to smaller bromeliads tending to contain a subset of the invertebrate species found in larger ones. These relationships were quite weak, but strongly significant (Table 3). The correlations with geographic distance were qualitatively identical to those with altitudinal distance, but were quantitatively much weaker and less significant, suggesting that the trend with geographic distance was an indirect result of the altitudinal relationship. Indeed, using partial Mantel tests, when controlling for altitudinal differences no significant correlations between dissimilarity and geographic distance remained, while the correlations with altitude remained almost unchanged when controlling for geographic distance.

**Table 3** Beta diversity partitioning: results of Mantel tests correlating pairwise dissimilarity of aquatic invertebrate communities inhabiting bromeliads with pairwise distance or differences in environmental variables

Dissimilarity measure	Geographic distance	Altitudinal distance	Size difference
Sorensen	0.05**	0.19***	0.16***
Simpson (turnover)	0.05*	0.16***	0.02
Nestedness-resultant	−0.01	−0.02	0.17***
Jaccard	0.06**	0.19***	0.16***
Turnover (Jaccard)	0.05*	0.14***	0.01
Nestedness-resultant (Jaccard)	−0.02	−0.03	0.12***

Size was measured as the first principal component of the size variables. Values given are Mantel's  $r$ , with significance indicated as \*  $0.05 > P > 0.01$ , \*\*  $0.01 > P > 0.001$ , \*\*\*  $P = 0.001$ .  $P$  values were derived from 999 permutations using the 'vegan' package in R, which returns the number of permutations in which the observed  $r$  is exceeded plus one, then divided by 1,000; thus \*\*\* represents cases where none of the permutations exceeded the observed correlation. Because the 'P' value returned is one-tailed, we have doubled it before binning into significance categories, to approximate two-tailed testing (note: this assumes a symmetric distribution of  $r$  in permutations; no cases were marginal). For negative correlations, we first subtracted the returned 'P' from 1

This suggests no effect of geographic distance in our study system.

Based on the selection of altitude in the multivariate analysis, its importance in the beta diversity analysis, but its lack of significance in the species richness analysis, we examined possible altitudinal patterns in various measures of species diversity, using our four altitude categories (see 'Materials and methods'). Again refuting prediction 5, we found no significant differences between the categories in any of species richness ( $H = 1.345$ ,  $P = 0.718$ ), total abundance ( $H = 0.273$ ,  $P = 0.435$ ), Shannon–Weiner ( $H = 2.85$ ,  $P = 0.415$ ), Margalef ( $H = 1.13$ ,  $P = 0.770$ ) or evenness ( $H = 4.76$ ,  $P = 0.190$ ).

Finally, species richness did not differ ( $F = 0.005$ ,  $P = 0.941$ ) between isolated phytotelmata (SOLO) and phytotelmata occurring in clusters (MULTI) (prediction 2). Nor did community composition differ between the two, as judged by RDA analysis, either with SOLO versus MULTI as the single explaining variable (total sum of the eigenvalues = 0.015,  $F = 0.774$ ,  $P = 0.687$ ) or additionally with the

different sampling locations as a covariable (total sum of the eigenvalues = 0.015,  $F = 0.888$ ,  $P = 0.554$ ).

## Discussion

With the exception of the influence of habitat patch size, there is remarkably little evidence of classic biogeographic and environmental relationships affecting the diversity in the aquatic invertebrate bromeliad system. These observations support the notion that bromeliads, although easily recognised as an insular habitat system (e.g. Richardson, 1999), do not follow the classic island biogeography theory in a strict sense. After the publication of the ETIB in 1967, the concept was applied to a wide diversity of habitats with insular characteristics. This was further reinforced by application of the metacommunity concept (see Leibold et al., 2004), a conceptual framework based on well-delineated communities. The small community size, temporal instability and highly dynamic colonisation and emigration of most of its inhabitants position the bromeliad phytotelm rather near one extreme of a habitat continuum to which the theory could be applied. In particular, the high emigration rate (associated with the emergence of the insect larvae) sets this habitat apart from most other island habitats to which island biogeographic theories (generally) are applied. The dynamics of the insect-dominated invertebrate communities leave little room for extinction or speciation to play significant roles in individual bromeliad communities, and their richness is probably due largely to factors determining the colonisation of bromeliads. The dynamics of the passively dispersing members in these communities are expected to be quite different. Previous research on Ostracoda in Jamaican bromeliads (Little & Hebert, 1996) recorded a high diversification rate in bromeliads, most probably due to the limited dispersal between bromeliad clusters of these organisms. This subset of the bromeliad invertebrate communities could lean more towards the classic ETIB. In our system, this was difficult to test because of the limited occurrence of microcrustaceans in the sampled bromeliads.

The species–area relationship is the most pervasive of the classic relationships assessed in this study, and it was by far the strongest physical or geographic determinant of either species richness or abundance

in the invertebrate communities we analysed. The size of the bromeliad (600 g range in fresh weight) was positively related to the number of species in the community (Fig. 1), a semi-log relationship typical of a species–area curve. Size accounted for about one-third of the variance in species richness. This is consistent with prediction 1 from the biogeographic theory. The strong inter-correlation of the variables measuring bromeliad size suggests that most of those could be used reliably to quantify habitat size. Seventeen of the forty-two invertebrate species in our data tended to be found more in larger bromeliads (significant positive correlations between each species' abundance and bromeliad size, on a species-by-species basis). We tested whether this might reflect a sampling effect by regressing each species' abundance on bromeliad size with the total number of invertebrates in the bromeliad (total abundance) as a covariate. For three of the seventeen species, the tendency to be found in larger bromeliads could entirely be accounted for by the total abundance (sampling effect). For ten of the species, however, bromeliad size remained significant after accounting for total abundance, suggesting a size effect over and above a sampling effect in about a quarter of the species in our dataset. Whatever the mechanism, this tendency for some species to be lacking from smaller bromeliads is also reflected in the relationship between bromeliad size and the nestedness component of community dissimilarity.

The positive relationship between phytotelm size and community size or structure supports previous findings, both for bromeliad communities specifically (Richardson, 1999) and for aquatic communities more generally (e.g. Srivastava and Lawton, 1998; Kitching, 2000; Armbruster et al., 2002; Frank et al., 2004). Mechanistic interpretation of this association, however, is not straightforward because habitat size is strongly collinear with various likely influences, as is usually the case. Mechanistic elements associated with habitat size that are often thought to affect community size and structure include a larger target for dispersing individuals or any component of size that positively influences colonisation, larger populations and thus smaller extinction probability, and greater habitat complexity or diversity (e.g. Hortal et al., 2009).

For invertebrate communities inhabiting bromeliads, the number of leaves is often used as an indicator for the complexity or diversity of the bromeliad habitat

(Srivastava, 2006). The aquatic habitat in the phytotelm is composed of many small compartments, associated with the individual leaves, arranged in a spiral, and one relatively large central compartment at the centre. These compartments are isolated in the sense that they collect their own water and organic debris but are all connected in that most aquatic organisms can move from one leaf-axil compartment to the next. Aquatic invertebrate species in bromeliads such as mosquito larvae partition space in bromeliads to co-exist (Gilbert et al., 2008) and a more complex habitat is expected to be able to house more diverse communities. In our data, while the number of leaves did correlate positively with species richness (Table 2), in partial regression this variable did not significantly add to the variation accounted for by weight, while weight added a lot to the variation accounted for by the number of leaves. Very similar results were obtained when analysing total abundance of invertebrates, rather than species richness. These results suggest that habitat size, rather than habitat complexity, is what matters for the size and structure of the aquatic invertebrates living in the bromeliads—consistent with prediction 1 but not prediction 3.

While the diversity in larger habitats can be a direct result of better survival of populations, with the larger habitat size allowing larger populations, which tend to persist longer, it is more plausible that the driving factors behind community structure in bromeliads is associated with the factors affecting the colonisation of the habitat patch. Larger aquatic habitats may have higher immigration because they represent a larger target (Dodson, 1992) or there might be active selection, whereby individuals select the larger habitat patches because this increases survival chances—a behaviour observed in other aquatic invertebrates (Binckley & Resetarits, 2005) and also for Odonata in bromeliads (Srivastava et al., 2008). Also the exposure time to colonisation could play a role. Larger bromeliads are typically older ones, available for colonisation longer. However, the highly dynamic nature of aquatic invertebrate communities in bromeliads, with most larval stages emerging and emigrating, and thus communities being reassembled frequently, may decrease the effect of longer exposure to colonisation. Older bromeliads are also usually the ones with more leaves, and this did not add to size in accounting for species richness or abundance.

The strong colonisation–emigration dynamics also suggest a strong rescue effect (Brown & Kodric-Brown, 1977). However, the strongest correlate of species richness in our dataset was total abundance ( $r = 0.71$  using  $\log(\text{abundance})$ ), which was related primarily to bromeliad size. The population size mechanism may operate partly through a sampling effect, with more colonising individuals representing more species by neutral or random assembly. We suggest that this might operate in combination with a preference for larger bromeliads, disproportionally decreasing the immigration to smaller bromeliads.

Inconsistent with prediction 2 (species richness–isolation relationship), we found no significant spatial structure in our species richness data. On a very local scale, positioning of the phytotelm (relative to water and resource inputs and other bromeliads) had little or no relationship with the overall invertebrate community, but was relevant for the passive dispersers (Crustacea). The number of bromeliads in the cluster (within 2 m) affected the community composition but there was no effect of presence/absence of other bromeliads on the same tree. On a larger spatial scale, geographic distance (9 km range) appeared to have no effect on species richness or community composition.

Altitude was not correlated with species richness or abundance, inconsistent with prediction 5. This was despite the 800-m altitudinal range sampled, which in ecological terms is very significant: from the lowest occurrences of bromeliads (in numbers greater than the odd scattered individual) to the upper montane dwarf forest at the highest altitude in the study area. Other overall diversity-related parameters (species diversity, evenness) did not vary significantly with altitude, nor could we detect the mid-altitude diversity bulge that occurs commonly in altitudinal studies (Rahbek, 1995, 2005). Currently, consensus on the mechanisms driving this pattern remains elusive, but climatic variables and an area effect are dominant elements in the discussion (Grytnes & McCain, 2007; McCain, 2007; Karger et al., 2011). In our study area, both climate and area change markedly with altitude—area because the mountains are approximately conical in shape. Temperature and evaporation decrease with altitude, while humidity increases; the tops of the mountains in Cusuco National Park are typically in cloud. The north-west side of the mountain range, facing the Atlantic Ocean, receives a particularly large amount of rainfall and has higher air humidity. Yet we

found no significant relationship between altitude and species richness.

Altitude was, however, associated with beta diversity and community composition, with the turnover component of community dissimilarity tending to increase with greater differences in altitude between host bromeliads. This corresponded with a tendency (usually weak) for some of the invertebrate species to occur primarily at either relatively low (some Dipteran larvae and a Coleopteran) or relatively high altitudes (some Chironomid and Culicid larvae). Thus, although the assemblage-level patterns seem invariant to altitude, some species replacement is evident.

Some studies on aquatic invertebrates suggest that bromeliad-specific local environment affects insect communities (Ngai et al., 2008), in particular the availability of resources (Srivastava et al., 2008) (prediction 4). Bromeliads obtain their nutrients from the decomposition of organic material that falls in the bromeliad (Richardson, 1999). Decomposing detritus is the main source of nitrogen for epiphytic bromeliads (Reich et al., 2003), at least for shaded ones, and Srivastava et al. (2008) found detrital mass to be a strong predictor of species richness in bromeliads within forests. Further, recent research shows that food webs in exposed phytotelmata are driven by primary production (Brouard et al., 2011). Srivastava et al. (2008) found detrital mass to be a strong predictor of species richness in bromeliads. In our data, although detritus content correlated strongly with bromeliad size ( $r = 0.87$ ), its correlation with total invertebrate abundance was much weaker ( $r = 0.44$ ). Indeed, detritus content added nothing to bromeliad size in accounting for variation in total abundance in a partial regression, and the same was true when modelling species richness. The same was also true when adding any variable related to bromeliad position (e.g. openness to light or rainfall input) to bromeliad size, in regressions to account for variation in total abundance or species richness. We thus found no evidence to support the idea that resource input is causing variation in community size or structure, though other measures of resource input might provide such evidence.

Overall, surprisingly few variables had significant explanatory power and the overall variance in community composition accounted for, using the measured physical and geographic variables in this study, was relatively low (around 20%). This may be partly

due to environmental factors not recorded in this study. Possible candidates include primary production by bacteria and algae within the bromeliads, though we would expect such an influence to be reflected in our detritus variable. More meaningful representation of the positioning of the bromeliad plants in relation to the forest canopy may provide some explanatory power. Even so, there is probably a large stochastic component present in the system. Bromeliad-held aquatic communities may be highly dynamic because of the ephemerality of the habitat patches, both the plants themselves and their water content (which fluctuates, including a seasonal component). Most of the invertebrates remain for a relatively short time, after which they emerge and emigrate from the phytotelm. When dispersing, most inhabitants are therefore highly mobile, either flying or using dispersal vectors that are highly mobile (Lopez et al., 2002). The importance of stochastic elements and the absence of strong short-distance dispersal limitation are in keeping the lack of any differences in diversity or community composition between bromeliads on trees host to no other bromeliads, and those that are found in clusters—even for the passively dispersing species. Chance and stochastic effects may therefore play a large role in these systems.

The low explanatory power of altitude and other measured environmental variables may also reflect a lack of meaningful differences in habitat within the bromeliads, for the invertebrates inhabiting them. Water temperature in bromeliads does vary with altitude, but also fluctuates considerably both seasonally and on a daily basis (Jocque & Kolby, 2012). Such an environmental regime may favour generalist species (Jocque et al., 2010b), rendering the environmental differences observed in the study rather small for the study organisms. These considerations are important because the system of bromeliad-held aquatic invertebrate communities appears to be an exception to the dominant pattern of strong diversity and community-composition changes with altitude (prediction 5). Further, given the strongly increasing density of tank bromeliads with altitude (in the study area, at least; Jocque et al., 2010a), the usual negative relationship between altitude and habitat area is broken. That is, while mountains are typically conical, giving lower area of higher altitudinal bands, the counteracting effect of increasing bromeliad density with altitude may cancel out, or perhaps even reverse, the usual trend.

In conclusion, most classic biogeographic and ecological relationships appear not to apply to aquatic invertebrate communities inhabiting bromeliads, perhaps because they are such a highly dynamic habitat system characterised by small patch sizes. Only the species–area relationship was strongly supported, and even this may have been mostly driven by factors affecting colonisation. Aquatic metacommunities in bromeliads (and other phytotelmata) may be highly suited to research on the effects of colonisation sequence and immigration rate on the stability of community composition. Particularly interesting here would be to investigate priority effects (De Meester et al., 2002), habitat selection and fixed colonisation sequences.

**Acknowledgments** We would like to thank the people living around Cuscu National Park for collaboration and guidance on the numerous excursions into the forest, namely those from Buenos Aires, Santo Tomas and Tierra Santa. Many thanks also to Operation Wallacea for supporting the research, and also to the enthusiastic volunteers of Operation Wallacea that assisted with data collection in the field, in particular J. Casteels, A. Belen, A. Kernahan, A. Nobes, J. Kolby and C. Willans. Merlijn Jocque was supported by a “Back to Belgium” grant from the Belgian Science Policy (BELSPO) issued in 2010.

## References

- Armbruster, P., R. A. Hutchinson & P. Cotgreave, 2002. Factors influencing community structure in a South American tank bromeliad fauna. *Oikos* 96: 225–234.
- Baselga, A., 2010. Partitioning the turnover and nestedness components of beta diversity. *Global Ecology and Biogeography* 19: 134–143.
- Benzing, D. H., 2000. *Bromeliaceae: Profile of an Adaptive Radiation*. Cambridge University Press, New York, NY.
- Binckley, C. A. & W. J. Retsartits, 2005. Habitat selection determines abundance, richness and species composition of beetles in aquatic communities. *Biology Letters* 1: 370–374.
- Brouard, O., A. H. Le Jeune, C. Leroy, R. Cereghino, O. Roux, L. Pelozuelo, A. Dejean, B. Corbara & J. F. Carrias, 2011. Are algae relevant to the detritus-based food web in tank-bromeliads? *PLoS ONE* 6: e20129. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0020129.
- Brown, J. H. & A. Kodric-Brown, 1977. Turnover rates in insular biogeography—effect of immigration on extinction. *Ecology* 58: 445–449.
- Cereghino, R., C. Leroy, J. F. Carrias, L. Pelozuelo, C. Segura, C. Bosc, A. Dejean & B. Corbara, 2011. Ant–plant mutualisms promote functional diversity in phytotelm communities. *Functional Ecology* 25: 954–963.
- Cotgreave, P., M. J. Hill & D. A. J. Middleton, 1993. The relationship between body-size and population-size in

- bromeliad tank faunas. *Biological Journal of the Linnean Society* 49: 367–380.
- De Meester, L., A. Gomez, B. Okamura & K. Schwenk, 2002. The monopolization hypothesis and the dispersal–gene flow paradox in aquatic organisms. *Acta Oecologica-International Journal of Ecology* 23: 121–135.
- Dézerald O., T. Stanislas, C. Leroy, J. Carrias, B. Corbara, A. Dejean & R. Céréghino, 2014. Environmental determinants of macroinvertebrate diversity in small water bodies: insights from tank-bromeliads. *Hydrobiologia* 723: 77–86.
- Dodson, S., 1992. Predicting crustacean zooplankton species richness. *Limnology and Oceanography* 37: 848–856.
- Field, R. & P. R. Long, 2007. Cusuco National Park, Honduras: Ecology of a Meso-American Cloud Forest. Operation Wallacea Ltd, Old Bolingbroke.
- Field, R., B. A. Hawkins, H. V. Cornell, D. J. Currie, J. A. F. Diniz-Filho, J.-F. Guégan, D. M. Kaufman, J. T. Kerr, G. G. Mittelbach, T. Oberdorff, E. M. O'Brien & J. R. G. Turner, 2009. Spatial species-richness gradients across scales: a meta-analysis. *Journal of Biogeography* 36: 132–147.
- Fish, D., 1976. Structure and composition of the aquatic invertebrate community inhabiting epiphytic bromeliads in South Florida and the discovery of an insectivorous bromeliad. PhD dissertation. University of Florida.
- Frank, J. H. & L. P. Lounibos, 1983. Phytotelmata: Terrestrial Plants as Hosts for Aquatic Insect Communities. Plexus, Medford, NJ.
- Frank, J. H. & L. P. Lounibos, 2009. Insects and allies associated with bromeliads: a review. *Terrestrial Arthropod Reviews* 1: 125–153.
- Frank, J. H., S. Sreenivasan, P. J. Benshoff, M. A. Deyrup, G. B. Edwards, S. E. Halbert, A. B. Hamon, M. D. Lowman, E. L. Mockford, R. H. Scheffrahn, G. J. Steck, M. C. Thomas, T. J. Walker & W. C. Welbourne, 2004. Invertebrate animals extracted from native *Tillandsia* (Bromeliales: Bromeliaceae) in Sarasota County, Florida. *Florida Entomologist* 87: 176–185.
- Gilbert, B., D. S. Srivastava & K. R. Kirby, 2008. Niche partitioning at multiple scales facilitates coexistence among mosquito larvae. *Oikos* 117: 944–950.
- Greeney, H. F., 2001. The insects of plant-held waters: a review and bibliography. *Journal of Tropical Ecology* 17: 241–260.
- Grytnes, J. A. & C. M. McCain, 2007. Elevational patterns in species richness. In Levin, S. (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Biodiversity*. Elsevier, Inc., Oxford.
- Hortal, J., K. A. Triantis, S. Meiri, E. Thebault & S. Sfenthourakis, 2009. Island species richness increases with habitat diversity. *American Naturalist* 174: E205–E217.
- Jabiol, J., B. Corbara, A. Dejean & R. Cereghino, 2009. Structure of aquatic insect communities in tank-bromeliads in an East-Amazonian rainforest in French Guiana. *Forest Ecology and Management* 257: 351–360.
- Jocque, M. & J. Kolby, 2012. Acidity of tank bromeliad water in a cloud forest, Cusuco National Park, Honduras. *International Journal of Plant Physiology and Biochemistry* 4: 59–70.
- Jocque, M., A. Kernahan, A. Nobes, C. Willians & R. Field, 2010a. How effective are non-destructive sampling methods to assess aquatic invertebrate diversity in bromeliads? *Hydrobiologia* 649: 293–300.
- Jocque, M., R. Field, L. Brendonck & L. De Meester, 2010b. Climatic control of dispersal–ecological specialization trade-offs: a metacommunity process at the heart of the latitudinal diversity gradient? *Global Ecology and Biogeography* 19: 244–252.
- Karger, D. N., J. Kluge, T. Kromer, A. Hemp, M. Lehnert & M. Kessler, 2011. The effect of area on local and regional elevational patterns of species richness. *Journal of Biogeography* 38: 1177–1185.
- Kitching, R. L., 2000. *Food Webs and Container Habitats: The Natural History and Ecology of Phytotelmata*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Laessle, A. M., 1961. A micro-limnological study of Jamaican bromeliads. *Ecology* 42: 499–517.
- Leibold, M. A., M. Holyoak, N. Mouquet, P. Amarasekare, J. M. Chase, M. F. Hoopes, R. D. Holt, J. B. Shurin, R. Law, D. Tilman, M. Loreau & A. Gonzalez, 2004. The metacommunity concept: a framework for multi-scale community ecology. *Ecology Letters* 7: 601–613.
- Little, T. & P. D. N. Hebert, 1996. Endemism and ecological islands: the ostracods from Jamaican bromeliads. *Freshwater Biology* 36: 327–338.
- Lopez, L. C. S., D. A. Goncalves, A. Mantovani & R. I. Rios, 2002. Bromeliad ostracods pass through amphibian (*Scinax perpusillus*) and mammalian guts alive. *Hydrobiologia* 485: 209–211.
- MacArthur, R. H. & E. O. Wilson, 1967. *The Theory of Island Biogeography*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ.
- Maguire, B., 1971. Phytotelmata: biota and community structure determination in plant-held waters. *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics* 2: 439–464.
- McCain, C. M., 2007. Area and mammalian elevational diversity. *Ecology* 88: 76–86.
- Mendes, H. F., T. Andersen & M. Jocque, 2011. A new species of *Polypedium* Kieffer from bromeliads in Parque Nacional Cusuco, Honduras (Chironomidae: Chironominae). *Zootaxa* 3062: 46–54.
- Montero, G., C. Feruglio & I. M. Barberis, 2010. The phytotelmata and foliage macrofauna assemblages of a bromeliad species in different habitats and seasons. *Insect Conservation and Diversity* 3: 92–201.
- Ngai, J. T., K. R. Kirby, B. Gilbert, B. M. Starzomski, A. D. J. Pelletier & J. C. R. Conner, 2008. The impact of land-use change on larval insect communities: testing the role of habitat elements in conservation. *Ecoscience* 15: 160–168.
- Picado, C., 1913. Les Bromeliacees Epiphytes. *Bulletin Scientifique Tome* 47: 216–360.
- R Studio, 2012. *RStudio: Integrated Development Environment for R* (Version 0.96.122) [Computer Software]. RStudio, Boston.
- Rahbek, C., 1995. The elevational gradient of species richness—a uniform pattern. *Ecography* 18: 200–205.
- Rahbek, C., 2005. The role of spatial scale and the perception of large-scale species-richness patterns. *Ecology Letters* 8: 224–239.
- Rangel, T., J. A. F. Diniz-Filho & L. M. Bini, 2006. Towards an integrated computational tool for spatial analysis in macroecology and biogeography. *Global Ecology and Biogeography* 15: 321–327.
- Reich, A., J. J. Ewel, N. M. Nadkarni, T. Dawson & R. D. Evans, 2003. Nitrogen isotope ratios shift with plant size in tropical bromeliads. *Oecologia* 137: 587–590.

- Richardson, B. A., 1999. The bromeliad microcosm and the assessment of faunal diversity in a Neotropical forest. *Biotropica* 31: 321–336.
- Rohde, K., 1992. Latitudinal gradients in species diversity—the search for the primary cause. *Oikos* 65: 514–527.
- Srivastava, D. S., 2006. Habitat structure, trophic structure and ecosystem function: interactive effects in a bromeliad–insect community. *Oecologia* 149: 493–504.
- Srivastava, D. S. & J. H. Lawton, 1998. Why more productive sites have more species: an experimental test of theory using tree-hole communities. *American Naturalist* 152: 510–529.
- Srivastava, D. S., J. Kolasa, J. Bengtsson, A. Gonzalez, S. P. Lawler, T. E. Miller, P. Munguia, T. Romanuk, D. C. Schneider & M. K. Trzcinski, 2004. Are natural microcosms useful model systems for ecology? *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* 19: 379–384.
- Srivastava, D. S., M. K. Trzcinski, B. A. Richardson & B. Gilbert, 2008. Why are predators more sensitive to habitat size than their prey? Insights from bromeliad insect food webs. *American Naturalist* 172: 761–771.
- StatSoft, Inc., 2012. STATISTICA (data analysis software system), version 11. [www.statsoft.com](http://www.statsoft.com).
- Sugden, A. M. & R. J. Robins, 1979. Aspects of the ecology of vascular epiphytes in Colombian cloud forests. 1. Distribution of the epiphytic flora. *Biotropica* 11: 173–188.
- ter Braak, C. J. F. & P. Šmilauer, 2002. *CANOCO Reference Manual and CanoDraw for Windows User's Guide: Software for Canonical Community Ordination* (version 4.5). Microcomputer Power, Ithaca NY.