



**HAL**  
open science

# Constraints imposed by pollinator behaviour on the ecology and evolution of plant mating systems

Celine Devaux, Clotilde Lepers, Emmanuelle Porcher

► **To cite this version:**

Celine Devaux, Clotilde Lepers, Emmanuelle Porcher. Constraints imposed by pollinator behaviour on the ecology and evolution of plant mating systems. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology*, 2014, 27, pp.1413-1430. 10.1111/jeb.12380 . hal-01110833

**HAL Id: hal-01110833**

**<https://hal.science/hal-01110833v1>**

Submitted on 9 Aug 2019

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

1 **SEX UNCOVERED SPECIAL ISSUE:**

2 **CONSTRAINTS IMPOSED BY POLLINATOR BEHAVIOUR ON THE ECOLOGY AND EVOLUTION OF**  
3 **PLANT MATING SYSTEMS**

4

5 Céline Devaux<sup>1\*</sup>, Clotilde Lepers<sup>2\*</sup>, and Emmanuelle Porcher<sup>3</sup>

6

7 <sup>1</sup> Institut des Sciences de l'Evolution de Montpellier, Université Montpellier 2, UMR 5554,  
8 34095 Montpellier, France

9 <sup>2</sup> Laboratoire de Génétique et Évolution des Populations Végétales, UMR CNRS 8198  
10 Bâtiment SN2 ; Université des Sciences et Technologies de Lille - Lille 1 ; F-59 655,  
11 Villeneuve d'Ascq Cedex, France;

12 <sup>3</sup> Division of Biology, Imperial College London, Silwood Park Campus, Ascot, Berkshire SL5  
13 7PY, United Kingdom  
14 and Centre d'Ecologie et des Sciences de la Conservation, UMR MNHN-CNRS-UPMC 7204,  
15 75005 Paris, France

16

17 \*Both authors contributed equally to this work

18

19 **RUNNING TITLE:** Pollinator constraints on plant mating

20

21 **CORRESPONDING AUTHOR:** Emmanuelle Porcher

22 UMR 7204 CESCO – CP 53

23 Muséum national d'Histoire naturelle – 61 rue Buffon – 75005 Paris – France

24 Email: porcher@mnhn.fr

25 Phone: (+33) 1 40 79 53 61 / Fax: (+33) 1 40 79 38 35

1 **ABSTRACT**

2 Most flowering plants rely on pollinators for their reproduction. Plant-pollinator interactions,  
3 although mutualistic, can create a conflict of interest between both partners and constrain  
4 plant mating systems at multiple levels, including the immediate ecological plant selfing rates,  
5 their distribution in and contribution to pollination networks, and their evolution. Here, we  
6 first review experimental evidence that pollinator behaviour influences ecological plant  
7 selfing rates in pairs of interacting species, and that reciprocally plants can modify pollinator  
8 behaviour through plastic and evolutionary changes in floral traits. We also examine how  
9 theoretical studies include pollinators, implicitly or explicitly, to investigate the role of their  
10 foraging behaviour in plant mating system evolution. In doing so, we call for more  
11 evolutionary models combining ecological and genetic factors, and additional experimental  
12 data, particularly to describe pollinator foraging behaviour. We finally show that recent  
13 developments in ecological network theory clarify the impact of community-level interactions  
14 on plant selfing rates and their evolution, and allow for new research avenues to expand the  
15 study of mating systems of animal-pollinated plant species to the level of the plant-pollinator  
16 networks.

17

18 **KEYWORDS**

19 Pollinator foraging behaviour; Floral traits; Selfing rates; Plasticity; Inbreeding depression;  
20 Plant-pollinator interactions; Mutualistic networks

1 **INTRODUCTION**

2 Flowering plants are stimulating models for studying the evolutionary biology of reproductive  
3 systems, owing to their wide diversity of mating systems (Barrett, 2003; Charlesworth, 2006).  
4 Typical topics of interest comprise the evolution of selfing rates (Goodwillie *et al.*, 2005),  
5 including self-incompatibility (Goldberg *et al.*, 2010), the evolution of separate sexes (Spigler  
6 & Ashman, 2012) and sex chromosomes (Charlesworth, 2013), and the maintenance of sexual  
7 reproduction (Silvertown, 2008). The reproduction of the vast majority of Angiosperm  
8 species is unique in its reliance on animals as pollen vectors (~90%, Ollerton *et al.*, 2011), yet  
9 the study of plant mating system evolution has long remained uncoupled from pollination  
10 ecology, focusing primarily on genetic drivers. As mentioned by Charlesworth (2006), the  
11 failure to include ecological mechanisms into the evolution of plant mating may be due to  
12 their diversity: “*Models of mating system evolution have emphasised genetic effects, even*  
13 *though (...) ecological circumstances, such as pollinator abundance or plant density, must*  
14 *often be important. Their complexity and variety, however, creates difficulties in developing*  
15 *any general theories”.*

16 The gap between the study of plant mating systems and pollination ecology has shrunk  
17 over the past decades, with many studies focusing mostly on animal-pollinated plants  
18 (reviewed e.g. in Harder & Barrett, 1996, 2006; Goodwillie *et al.*, 2005; Mitchell *et al.*, 2009;  
19 Eckert *et al.*, 2010; Karron *et al.*, 2012; Thomann *et al.*, 2013) but also on wind-pollinated  
20 plants (Friedman & Barrett, 2009). This rich literature has revealed general patterns and  
21 processes out of the complexity mentioned by Charlesworth (2006). One such pattern is the  
22 increase in selfing rates under pollen limitation and its long-term evolutionary consequences  
23 (Wright *et al.*, 2013). This intuitive expectation can now be challenged as pollinator  
24 abundance decline and reduced pollination service become a worldwide reality (Potts *et al.*,  
25 2010; Gonzalez-Varo *et al.*, 2013). Several papers discuss pollinator shortage as a cause of

1 outcross pollen limitation (see glossary) and increased immediate ecological selfing rates,  
2 which may determine future evolutionary changes in plant mating systems (Eckert *et al.*,  
3 2010; Thomann *et al.*, 2013). The latter prediction is supported by rapid evolution of the  
4 ability to self-fertilize observed in *Mimulus guttatus* in the absence of pollinators (Bobdyl  
5 Roels & Kelly, 2011).

6 Pollinator foraging behaviour also emerges as an important factor influencing plant  
7 selfing rates and their evolution. The predicted impact of foraging behaviour on plant mating  
8 systems is however less clear than that of pollinator abundance because selection on  
9 pollinator vs. plant traits do not always act in the same direction. In plants, selection favours  
10 floral traits that influence pollen transfer to promote reception of conspecific and compatible  
11 pollen, increase the quantity and quality of seeds produced (including the ratio of selfed to  
12 outcrossed seeds) and the amount of pollen exported to conspecifics. In pollinators, selection  
13 favours traits that maximize the rate of energy gain through foraging behaviour (optimal  
14 foraging theory, Pyke, 1984), which may lead to non-optimal pollen transfer for plants.  
15 Hence, although plants and pollinators are involved in true mutualistic interactions with  
16 reciprocal benefits, conflicts of interest are widespread (Bronstein, 2001; Dufay & Anstett,  
17 2003; De Jong & Klinkhamer, 2005, p. 229). Constraints imposed by pollinators on plants, as  
18 well as constraints imposed by plants on pollinators, may induce plastic and evolutionary  
19 responses, such that the two partners are engaged in a permanent Red Queen-like co-  
20 evolutionary race. The coevolution of plant and pollinator traits has been a major topic of  
21 research since Darwin, but constraints imposed by pollinator foraging behaviour on the  
22 ecology and evolution of plant mating systems are seldom integrated into experimental and  
23 theoretical studies. For example, most models of the evolution of plant selfing rates assume  
24 that these rates can evolve freely between zero and one. Another limit of studies connecting  
25 mating systems and pollination ecology is that they are often restricted to pairs of plant-

1 pollinator species. Recent developments in ecological network theory have revealed that the  
2 community context, multi-species interactions, and the position of a species in a plant-  
3 pollinator network can be key to understand the influence of pollinators on plant mating  
4 systems (Vanbergen *et al.*, 2014).

5       Here, we review how the interplay between pollinator behaviour and plant floral traits  
6 influences the immediate, ecological plant selfing rates (hereafter “ecological selfing rates”),  
7 the evolution of selfing rates, and their distribution in plant-pollinator networks (summarized  
8 in Fig. 1). We are interested in self-compatible plants, mostly with perfect flowers, that are  
9 pollinated by insects or birds (Buchmann & Nabhan, 1996), particularly bees and  
10 hummingbirds for which we have more data. In the first section, we show that the ecological  
11 selfing rates of about one half of flowering plant species is controlled partly by pollinator  
12 abundance and behaviour, which should therefore be included in theoretical investigation of  
13 plant mating system evolution. We argue, as do Karron *et al.* (2012), that the reciprocal  
14 effects of pollinator behaviour on floral traits are much better documented than their  
15 consequences for plant self-fertilization. Because we focus on pollinator behaviour, we  
16 intentionally exclude pollinator abundance, pollen limitation and their influence on the  
17 selection of floral traits, which were presented extensively elsewhere (Elzinga *et al.*, 2007;  
18 Eckert *et al.*, 2010; Schiestl & Johnson, 2013; Thomann *et al.*, 2013). One should keep in  
19 mind that these two components strongly determine ecological selfing rates and their  
20 evolution.

21       The second part of this review examines how theoretical studies of the evolution of  
22 plant selfing rates include pollinator behaviour and model the plant traits that can alleviate the  
23 constraints it might impose. We show that mechanistic models combining pollinator  
24 behaviour and the genetic consequences of selfing improve on pure ecological or pure genetic  
25 models by providing quantitative predictions of evolutionarily and ecologically stable plant

1 mating strategies. We propose a method to account for pollination ecology in models of the  
2 evolution of selfing rates, and provide experimental research avenues to help clarify the role  
3 of plant-pollinator interactions in the distribution of plant selfing rates. The last section shows  
4 that community-level processes can influence the ecology and evolution of plant mating  
5 systems, and outline how to use current knowledge on competing vs. facilitative interactions  
6 among plant species and pollinator species for a better understanding of the distribution and  
7 evolution of plant selfing rates.

8

#### 9 **THE INTERPLAY BETWEEN POLLINATOR BEHAVIOUR AND FLORAL TRAITS DETERMINES** 10 **ECOLOGICAL PLANT SELFING RATES**

11 The selfing rate or self-fertilization rate  $s$  is the fraction of selfed embryos produced by an  
12 individual plant. This fraction depends primarily on the rate of self-pollination, the relative  
13 amounts of self vs. outcross pollen transferred by pollinators or through non-pollinator means  
14 (e.g. stigma dragging). The self-pollination rate can be further modified by pre and post-  
15 fertilization selection (see glossary), which is beyond the scope of this review. Only two  
16 categories of plant species have complete control over their selfing rate, although pollinators  
17 may still influence their seed set: (1) obligately outcrossing species ( $s = 0$ ), such as self-  
18 incompatible or dioecious species, representing ca. 50% of species (Igic & Kohn, 2006) and  
19 (2) completely selfing species ( $s = 1$ ) relying on prior autonomous selfing (see glossary), such  
20 as species producing closed flowers only, which are however extremely rare (Goodwillie *et*  
21 *al.*, 2005; Culley & Klooster, 2007).

22 In the remaining half of animal-pollinated plant species, selfing rates are invariably  
23 influenced by pollinators, via the quantities of both outcross and self-pollen transferred  
24 among and within flowers (Figs. 1 and 2). Outcross pollen deposition on plant stigmas is  
25 always fully constrained by pollinators. In contrast, self-pollen deposition on stigmas depends

1 only partially, but sometimes strongly, on pollinators as it includes: (1) facilitated self-  
2 pollination, the transfer of self-pollen within flowers caused by pollinator visits, (2)  
3 geitonogamous self-pollination caused by pollinator visits among flowers on a plant, and (3)  
4 autonomous, i.e. without the help of pollinators, prior, competing and delayed self-pollination  
5 within flowers (Fig. 2 and definitions of the glossary). Note that the amount of self-pollen  
6 deposited “autonomously” by a plant on stigmas may still be influenced by previous outcross  
7 pollen limitation, as is sometimes the case with delayed autonomous selfing (e.g. Ruan *et al.*,  
8 2010). Besides, even if the *amount* of autonomous self-pollen is under the plant control, the  
9 *rate* of self-pollination depends on pollinators via the amounts of self and outcross pollen they  
10 deposit on stigmas.

11 In the following, we examine how pollinator behavioural traits interact with plant traits  
12 to constrain patterns of outcross and self-pollen deposition and thereby the ecological selfing  
13 rates of plants. We review how pollinators can respond plastically to variation in floral traits  
14 to optimize their energy gains, and which floral traits can vary plastically or genetically to  
15 modify pollinator behaviour and control plant selfing rates. We consider one self-compatible  
16 plant species specialized (see glossary) on one pollinator species or functional group (Fenster  
17 *et al.*, 2004), as is frequently done in studies of the relationship between pollinators and plant  
18 mating systems. Pollinator choice among multiple plant species (preference and constancy,  
19 see glossary), competition among plant species for shared pollinators, and their impacts on  
20 plant selfing rates are discussed only in the last section.

### 21 ***Pollinator traits influencing outcross and self-pollen transfer***

22 Self-pollination rates are influenced by (1) the number of pollinator visits to individual plants  
23 and flowers, (2) the efficiency of pollen transfer from stamens to pollinators and from  
24 pollinators to stigmas, within and among flowers, and (3) the composition of pollen loads on  
25 pollinators, particularly the fraction of self vs. outcross pollen. All these components



1 ultimately depend on pollinator abundance, morphological and phenological matching of  
2 plants and pollinators, and pollinator foraging behaviour among and within plants. We focus  
3 on pollinator behaviour (Fig. 1) and do not address pollinator abundance, phenology or  
4 morphology (see e.g. Waser, 1978; Harder & Barrett, 1996 for details on pollen placement on  
5 pollinators; or O'Neil, 1997; Elzinga *et al.*, 2007; Bartomeus *et al.*, 2011 for phenology).

6 Pollinator grooming behaviour influences pollen transfer efficiency within and among  
7 plants; its intensity and timing greatly determine patterns of pollen deposition of outcross and  
8 self-pollen throughout a foraging bout (see glossary). Grooming generally causes pollen to be  
9 deposited on fewer flowers (e.g. Harder *et al.*, 2000; Castellanos *et al.*, 2003), hence reduces  
10 pollen carryover, with contrasting impacts of within- vs. between-plant grooming. Between-  
11 plant grooming reduces pollen dispersal among plants (Holmquist *et al.*, 2012) and is likely to  
12 increase outcross pollen limitation. Within-plant, between-flower grooming reduces pollen  
13 carryover within plants and should increase geitonogamous selfing rates (Matsuki *et al.*,  
14 2008). The scant available data suggest that most grooming occurs between plants (see e.g.  
15 Harder, 1990; Mitchell *et al.*, 2004; Johnson *et al.*, 2005), but the pattern may vary among  
16 pollinator species and depend on pollen availability, as shown by a higher probability of  
17 grooming between flowers with increasing pollen availability (Harder, 1990). More intensive  
18 and more frequent grooming is observed for pollen-collecting visitors (e.g. bees) than for  
19 nectar-collecting visitors (e.g. birds or moths; (Thomson, 1986; Castellanos *et al.*, 2003). As a  
20 result, nectar-feeding species tend to transfer pollen more efficiently than do pollen-feeding  
21 species (Conner *et al.*, 1995; Sahli & Conner, 2007; but see King *et al.*, 2013). More  
22 generally, the extent of pollen carryover is negatively related to geitonogamous selfing rates  
23 (Geber, 1985; Robertson, 1992a; Morris *et al.*, 1994): pollinators that deposit most of their  
24 outcross pollen on the first few flowers transfer mostly self-pollen on the subsequent flowers  
25 of the plant. Grooming can partially cause the negative relationship between pollen carryover

1 and geitonogamy (Rademaker *et al.*, 1997; Matsuki *et al.*, 2008), but pollen carryover is also  
2 strongly governed by interactions between pollinator morphology and floral design (Harder &  
3 Barrett, 1996).

4       The number of flowers a pollinator probes successively on a plant increases  
5 geitonogamous self-pollination (Rademaker *et al.*, 1999; Karron *et al.*, 2009). Pollinators tend  
6 to probe more flowers on plants with larger floral displays (see glossary), but rarely probe  
7 more than a dozen flowers per plant, so that the fraction of flowers probed per plant is often a  
8 decreasing function of display size (reviewed in Snow *et al.*, 1996; Ohashi & Yahara, 2001;  
9 Harder *et al.*, 2004). Multiple reasons can explain why pollinators leave plants before visiting  
10 all open flowers on a plant (reviewed in Snow *et al.*, 1996); the most general one involves the  
11 maximization of energy gains (optimal foraging). For pollinators, which have limited short-  
12 term memory, visiting only a fraction of available flowers reduces the risk of visiting a given  
13 flower twice (Ohashi & Yahara, 1999, 2001, 2002). Similarly, pollinators leave a plant earlier  
14 when they encounter empty, rewardless flowers (e.g. Bailey *et al.*, 2007 and references  
15 therein). Self-pollination also depends on the order in which flowers of a plant are visited by  
16 pollinators. As the first few flowers visited by pollinators contribute the most to outcross  
17 pollen transfer, outcross pollination is expected to be larger when independent pollinators  
18 visit flowers randomly on a plant than when all pollinators visit flowers in the same order  
19 (Devaux *et al.*, unpublished manuscript, for a model).

20       All above characteristics of pollinators affect the transfer of outcross and self-pollen  
21 among flowers, but not within-flower facilitated selfing (see glossary), which remains little  
22 studied. Facilitated selfing has been demonstrated unambiguously in a small number of  
23 species(e.g. Anderson *et al.*, 2003; Duncan *et al.*, 2004; Johnson *et al.*, 2005; Owen *et al.*,  
24 2007; Vaughton *et al.*, 2008), but its broader contribution to total selfing rates in natural  
25 populations is currently unknown (see Box 1 for a method). It is unclear whether facilitated

1 selfing is primarily controlled by flower characteristics, such as spatial (herkogamy) or  
2 temporal (dichogamy) separation of anthers and stigmas (Lloyd & Webb, 1986; Webb &  
3 Lloyd, 1986; Brunet & Eckert, 1998) or if it can be influenced by pollinator behaviour. Buzz-  
4 pollination by native bees causes high rates of facilitated self-pollination in the partially self-  
5 incompatible *Dianella revoluta* (Duncan *et al.*, 2004). Furthermore, reduced time spent at  
6 individual flowers by hawkmoths has been associated with decreased seed production in self-  
7 compatible *Petunia* lines (Brandenburg *et al.*, 2012), but we do not know whether any of the  
8 effect can be attributed to facilitated selfing. From available experimental studies, we can  
9 nevertheless argue that increased numbers of flowers probed per plant or increased probing  
10 time per flower should contribute to increased facilitated selfing at the plant level.

### 11 ***Floral traits influencing self-pollination rates via pollinator behaviour***

12 Floral traits affecting self-pollination can be divided into three broad categories: (1) traits  
13 related to autonomous selfing (Lloyd & Schoen, 1992), (2) traits modifying mechanically  
14 pollinator-mediated outcross and self-pollen transfer, without altering pollinator behaviour  
15 (e.g. floral design, pollen size and stickiness, and within and among flowers temporal  
16 separation of male and female functions; Webb & Lloyd, 1986; Lloyd & Schoen, 1992) and  
17 (3) traits modifying pollinator behaviour directly. We focus on the latter floral traits, which  
18 typically influence two types of foraging behaviours: (3.1) patterns of flower visitation among  
19 plants (attraction, preference and constancy, see glossary), which are mostly discussed in the  
20 last section and (3.2) patterns of flower visitation within plants (number and sequence of  
21 flowers visited, as well as probing time).

22 Floral display (see glossary) may be the most studied plant trait influencing pollinator  
23 behaviour. Plants with larger floral displays attract more pollinators, thereby receiving more  
24 outcross and geitonogamous pollen (Snow *et al.*, 1996; Rademaker *et al.*, 1999; Karron *et al.*,  
25 2004; Williams, 2007). Floral display can be modified plastically, for example via flower

1 wilting when pollinators are abundant (Harder & Johnson, 2005), or flower abortion inducing  
2 pollinators to leave the plant (Ito & Kikuzawa, 2003); both mechanisms reduce the risk of  
3 geitonogamous selfing. Floral display can also be modified via evolutionary changes in the  
4 total flower production, in the distribution of open flowers among days (individual  
5 phenology) or in the longevity of flowers (Elzinga *et al.*, 2007; Devaux & Lande, 2010). How  
6 these changes in floral display modify selfing rates depends on the rates and patterns of  
7 flower visitation by pollinators but the general trend is again an increase in plant selfing rates  
8 with larger floral displays.

9       Many other floral traits are also cues for pollinator attraction and influence visitation  
10 rates and outcross pollen receipt. These include flower size, reward production, floral shape,  
11 colour, and scent (Cozzolino & Scopece, 2008), or more anecdotal characteristics, such as  
12 colourful leaves (Keasar *et al.*, 2009), sterile anthers (staminodes, Sandvik & Totland, 2003)  
13 or sterile flowers (e.g. *Centaurea cyanus*, Garcia-Jacas *et al.*, 2001). Nectar production and its  
14 replenishment dynamics have received particular attention, because they are critically related  
15 to geitonogamy. For example, bumblebees experiencing unrewarding (nectarless) plants  
16 probe more flowers on subsequent rewarding plants, such that the geitonogamous selfing rates  
17 of rewarding plants increased with the frequency of unrewarding plants in the population  
18 (Ferdy & Smithson, 2002). Conversely, maintaining nectarless flowers within an otherwise  
19 nectar-producing inflorescence may encourage pollinators to leave a plant early, thereby  
20 reducing geitonogamy (Hirabayashi *et al.*, 2006; Bailey *et al.*, 2007 and references therein;  
21 Whitehead *et al.*, 2012). Pollinator behaviour within a plant, hence geitonogamy, can also be  
22 modified by floral complexity (more flowers visited in plants with simpler flowers, Ohashi,  
23 2002) or inflorescence architecture (e.g. lower selfing in racemes vs. umbels, Harder *et al.*,  
24 2004; Jordan & Harder, 2006; or in more tightly twisted inflorescences, Iwata *et al.*, 2012).

1           Again, floral traits influencing facilitated self-pollination are poorly known, apart from  
2 structural features preventing self-pollination, such as anther caps (Peter & Johnson, 2006)  
3 and spatial separation of sexes. In contrast, the production of complex floral design or shape  
4 can induce higher probing time (Ohashi, 2002), which can translate into higher seed set  
5 (Brandenburg *et al.*, 2012), potentially because of higher facilitated selfing.

6           There is ample and long-standing evidence that plant selfing rates are constrained by  
7 pollinator morphology and foraging behaviour (Harder & Barrett, 1996), which may favour  
8 plant traits that can alleviate constraints imposed by pollinators. Evolution of plant traits  
9 under pollinator-mediated selection has been extensively studied (Elzinga *et al.*, 2007 for  
10 plant phenology; Schiestl & Johnson, 2013 for floral signals), but with surprisingly little  
11 emphasis on plant mating systems, except in verbal models (Eckert *et al.*, 2010; Thomann *et*  
12 *al.*, 2013). In the next section, we review the few theoretical studies that include pollinator  
13 behaviour in models of the evolution of plant mating systems. We argue that combining  
14 pollination ecology and the genetics of inbreeding depression is necessary to describe  
15 accurately and to understand plant mating system evolution. We conclude by pointing out  
16 experimental data needed to extend theoretical work on the evolution of plant mating system  
17 under pollinator constraints.

18

#### 19 **THE ROLE OF POLLINATORS IN THE EVOLUTION OF PLANT SELFING RATES**

20 We clarify how the interplay between plants and pollinators determines plant fitness  
21 components, besides selfing rates, and review how models of the evolution of selfing rates  
22 implicitly or explicitly integrate plant-pollinator interactions.

23 ***Constraints imposed by pollinators on plant fitness components and the evolution of plant***  
24 ***selfing rates***

1 The fitness of a plant is determined by the number of outcrossed and selfed seeds it produces  
2 and the number of pollen grains it successfully exports to other plants (male outcrossed siring  
3 success), weighted by the relative offspring fitnesses. Hence the fitness of animal-pollinated  
4 plants depends critically on pollinators, also via resource allocation to attraction traits, and on  
5 inbreeding depression (see glossary, Lloyd, 1979; Lande & Schemske, 1985; Charlesworth &  
6 Willis, 2009)

7 Two major phenomena involving pollinators and influencing plant fitness components  
8 are often included in studies of the evolution of plant selfing rates without explicit modelling  
9 of pollinators (reviewed in Goodwillie *et al.*, 2005): pollen limitation and pollen discounting  
10 (see glossary). Pollen limitation is a key component favouring the evolution of higher selfing  
11 rates (Cheptou, 2004; Porcher & Lande, 2005b) and depends greatly on pollinator abundance  
12 (Ashman *et al.*, 2004; Eckert *et al.*, 2010; Thomann *et al.*, 2013). Several authors have  
13 proposed that stronger outcross pollen limitation can mimic declines in pollinator density and  
14 hamper the evolution of complete outcrossing (Sakai & Ishii, 1999; Masuda *et al.*, 2001;  
15 Morgan & Wilson, 2005). Pollen discounting, a negative relationship between selfing rate and  
16 pollen export, can be caused by pollinators transferring large amounts of self-pollen among  
17 multiple flowers of plants, which are therefore lost for outcrossing (Karron & Mitchell, 2012),  
18 and hinders the evolution of high selfing rates (Goodwillie *et al.*, 2005).

19 More generally, correlations or functional relationships among fitness components are  
20 important drivers of the evolution of plant mating systems. Several models show that the  
21 maintenance of mixed mating can result from relationships between male fertility, female self  
22 fertility and female outcross fertility (including pollen discounting, Johnston *et al.*, 2009),  
23 between viability and selfing rate (Jordan & Otto, 2012), or between selfing and a cost of  
24 interaction with pollinators (Lepers *et al.*, unpublished manuscript). Correlations among plant  
25 fitness components are partly governed by pollinators (see below), particularly by their

1 foraging behaviour within plants in response to floral traits (e.g. floral display, Best &  
2 Bierzychudek, 1982). Yet, models that use these correlations without integrating pollinators  
3 explicitly are useful to address the effects of pollinators on selfing rates and have helped  
4 understand the qualitative role of pollination in the evolution of plant mating. Assuming a  
5 positive correlation between the number of selfed and outcrossed ovules is relevant for many  
6 animal-pollinated species in which more pollinator visits increase both geitonogamous self-  
7 pollination and the number of outcrossed seeds (Johnston *et al.*, 2009 and references therein).  
8 Similarly, a negative correlation between reward production and selfing rate (as in Lepers *et*  
9 *al.*, unpublished manuscript), or between the production of costly open (vs. closed) flowers  
10 and selfing rate (as in Masuda *et al.*, 2001; data in Oakley *et al.*, 2007) can be used to  
11 understand the evolution of selfing syndromes (see glossary; reviewed by Sicard & Lenhard,  
12 2011).

13 Further progress towards more reliable, quantitative predictions of equilibrium mating  
14 systems requires mechanistic models of the constraints that pollinator behaviour imposes on  
15 plant selfing rates, which are still few. Morgan *et al.* (2005) used optimal foraging theory to  
16 model evolution of selfing by assuming a decreasing rate of geitonogamous selfing with  
17 increasing plant density, which was justified because pollinators are more likely to switch  
18 between plants when flight distances are smaller (Cresswell, 1997; Mustajarvi *et al.*, 2001).  
19 Another approach has included the demography of plant and pollinator populations,  
20 highlighting the possibility of demographic extinction of pollinator and plant populations  
21 during the transition to higher selfing rates (Lepers *et al.*, unpublished manuscript), due to  
22 reduced production of rewards for pollinators. The most comprehensive mechanistic models  
23 tackle the evolution of floral traits influencing pollinator behaviour, and therefore plant  
24 selfing rates. For example, models that jointly describe the evolution of daily floral display  
25 and pollinator foraging behaviour show that pollinators can generate stable intermediate

1 geitonogamous selfing rates (de Jong *et al.*, 1992; Masuda *et al.*, 2001; Devaux *et al.*,  
2 unpublished manuscript). Similarly, models of the evolution of nectar content have analysed  
3 how the production of rewardless flowers can decrease the geitonogamous selfing rate of  
4 individual plants (Bailey *et al.*, 2007) and conversely how pollinator learning can increase the  
5 geitonogamous selfing rates of rewarding plants that co-occur with non-rewarding plants  
6 (Ferdy & Smithson, 2002).

7       Models combining pollinator foraging and the evolution of floral traits are promising  
8 tools to study the ecological drivers of plant mating system evolution, but they can still be  
9 improved. The number of flowers probed, hence the geitonogamous selfing rate of self-  
10 compatible hermaphrodite species, critically depends on pollinator foraging behaviour, but the  
11 latter is simplified in existing models: pollinators are assumed to visit all flowers on a plant  
12 (de Jong *et al.*, 1992), the number of pollinator visits per plant is assumed proportional to  
13 floral display (Masuda *et al.*, 2001, 2004), the probability to leave a plant is assumed  
14 unrelated to floral display (Devaux *et al.*, unpublished manuscript), and pollinators are  
15 assumed to leave a plant immediately after visiting a rewardless flower (Bailey *et al.*, 2007);  
16 these assumptions are at odds with empirical observations (Robertson, 1992b; Duan *et al.*,  
17 2005; Ishii & Harder, 2006). Such assumptions are unavoidable, and highlight the difficulty  
18 of including realistic but sufficiently general models of pollination ecology in models of the  
19 evolution of plant selfing rates (but see Ferdy & Smithson, 2002 for a model incorporating  
20 pollinator learning).

21 ***The interplay between pollinators and the dynamics of purging inbreeding depression***  
22 ***determines the evolution of plant selfing rates***

23 Inbreeding depression (see glossary and Box 2), the relative fitness of selfed vs. outcrossed  
24 offspring, is a central evolutionary force that has received much attention in the population  
25 genetics approach to studying plant mating system evolution (reviewed in Charlesworth &



1 Willis, 2009). The joint evolution of inbreeding depression and plant mating systems, i.e. the  
2 purging of deleterious mutations with increasing selfing rates, has been extensively studied  
3 both experimentally (Husband & Schemske, 1996) and theoretically, but has rarely been  
4 included in ecological models of plant mating system evolution. Allowing for an evolving  
5 rather than constant inbreeding depression in models of pollination ecology can nevertheless  
6 greatly alter the outcomes of models of the evolution of selfing. First, conditions favouring  
7 the maintenance of outcrossing are much more restricted in the presence of evolving rather  
8 than constant inbreeding depression (Porcher & Lande, 2005a; b). Second, purging creates a  
9 strong positive feedback on the evolution of selfing: an increase in the population selfing rate  
10 decreases inbreeding depression (Fig. 3), thereby strongly favouring the further evolution of  
11 increased selfing. This can destabilize equilibria that appear evolutionarily stable in models  
12 where inbreeding depression does not depend on the selfing rate. Porcher *et al.* (2009)  
13 demonstrated that incorporating a genetic model for inbreeding depression and the possibility  
14 of purging destabilizes intermediate selfing rates that would otherwise be maintained by  
15 temporal variation in inbreeding depression (Cheptou & Schoen, 2002).

16       The joint evolutionary dynamics of inbreeding depression and plant mating system are  
17 often overlooked in ecologically-oriented models because their analysis requires complex  
18 genetic models over and above the complexity of ecological processes. A method based on an  
19 approximation for the purging of inbreeding depression (e.g. Lande *et al.*, 1994) provides a  
20 powerful way around this complexity (Box 2), on the condition that genomic mutation rates to  
21 deleterious alleles causing inbreeding depression remains moderate (Box 2, Porcher & Lande,  
22 2013). This approximation has been used in some ecological models to study the joint role of  
23 ecological and genetic constraints in plant mating system evolution (Johnston, 1998; Devaux  
24 *et al.*, unpublished manuscript; Lepers *et al.*, unpublished manuscript). These models show  
25 that ecological and genetic mechanisms interact strongly to determine evolutionary outcomes.

1 For example, Devaux *et al.* (unpublished manuscript) identified two types of equilibrium  
2 selfing rates when modelling the evolution of floral display and geitonogamous selfing under  
3 pollinator constraints: (1) ecological equilibria constrained by pollinator behaviour only,  
4 which exist regardless of inbreeding depression, and (2) evolutionarily stable equilibria  
5 maintained by a trade-off between pollinator attraction and avoidance of geitonogamous  
6 selfing, and governed by evolving inbreeding depression. This model also suggests that a  
7 baseline rate of unavoidable geitonogamous selfing constrained by pollinators can trigger  
8 purging of inbreeding depression and create conditions favouring evolution of increased  
9 autonomous selfing. In view of this interaction between ecological and genetic mechanisms,  
10 we encourage modellers interested in the ecological drivers of plant mating system evolution  
11 to account for evolving inbreeding depression, which can be easily done using approximation  
12 methods (Box 2).

### 13 ***Experimental limits to theoretical models***

14 No model has yet analysed the joint evolution of plant selfing rates and pollinator  
15 characteristics: the morphologies and foraging behaviours of pollinators are generally  
16 assumed to be constant (but plastic) functions of floral signals. Univariate pollinator-mediated  
17 selection on multiple floral traits and their genetic architecture are well documented  
18 (Kingsolver *et al.*, 2001; Geber & Griffen, 2003; Ashman & Majetic, 2006; Karron *et al.*,  
19 1997; Galliot *et al.*, 2006). Several papers have shown that floral traits could adapt rapidly  
20 (Ashman *et al.*, 2004; Thomann *et al.*, 2013), and a recent review has suggested that plants  
21 could adapt more rapidly to pollinator-mediated selection than pollinators do to floral traits,  
22 which can explain why we frequently observe pollination syndromes and floral convergence  
23 in plants (Schiestl & Johnson, 2013 and references therein). Thus, the rarity of coevolutionary  
24 models could reflect the lack of data on traits and behaviour of pollinators, and their adaptive

1 potential, although a few models of coevolution of plant and pollinator traits do exist (Kiestler  
2 *et al.*, 1984; Zhang *et al.*, 2013), but do not address the evolution of plant mating.

3         Modelling the joint evolution of plant mating and pollinator traits would require the  
4 following experimental steps: (1) for plants, estimation of facilitated self-pollination and  
5 elucidation of pollinator characteristics and behaviour involved (see Box 1 for a method); (2)  
6 for plants again, estimation of the multivariate selection induced by pollinators on several  
7 floral traits simultaneously, as both direct and indirect (correlated) selection is responsible for  
8 the observed phenotypic distribution of floral traits; (3) for pollinators, accurate description of  
9 the genetic architecture (number of and correlation among genes) and the selection gradients  
10 on morphological and behavioural traits imposed by plants or their competitors; and (4)  
11 estimation of the adaptive potential of both floral and pollinator traits.

12

### 13 **THE RECIPROCAL CONTRIBUTION OF PLANT-POLLINATOR NETWORKS TO PLANT SELFING** 14 **RATES**

15 The interactions between plants and pollinators determine immediate ecological self-  
16 pollination rates, as well as the evolution of plant selfing rates. Most studies, both  
17 experimental and theoretical, address this topic by focusing on pairs of interacting species,  
18 whereas plants and their pollinators are part of complex interaction networks (Bascompte *et*  
19 *al.*, 2003; Strauss & Irwin, 2004; Poccock *et al.*, 2012), which should influence plant mating  
20 systems and their evolution. The combination of estimates from independent populations  
21 scattered across the globe indicates a U-shaped distribution of plant selfing rates, with a  
22 strong bias towards highly outcrossing species and numerous species with intermediate  
23 selfing rates (Goodwillie *et al.*, 2005; Iqic & Kohn, 2006). Whether this distribution is  
24 representative of local plant communities is debatable, nevertheless it is likely that selfing  
25 rates exhibit interspecific variation within communities. In the following we argue that (1) in

1 a network, the distribution of selfing rates of plant species that are not completely outcrossing  
2 or completely selfing can be explained partly by the multispecies interactions operating at an  
3 ecological time scale (Fig. 1), and (2) conversely, on longer time scales, the evolution of plant  
4 mating systems, particularly the transition to higher selfing, can constrain the architecture of  
5 plant-pollinator networks.

6 *The influence of the architecture of mutualistic networks on plant ecological selfing rates*  
7 *and their evolution*

8 Here, we review the scarce available data and make predictions for the expected impact of  
9 multispecies interactions on plant mating. We also point out the data needed to test these  
10 predictions and better understand community-level effects on plant selfing rates.

11 Plant-pollinator networks are shaped by pollinator optimal foraging and morphological  
12 or phenological matching between partners (e.g. Junker *et al.*, 2013). Within a given network,  
13 plants differ in the identity of their pollinators, which is a primary mechanism leading to  
14 differences in selfing rates in a plant community: different pollinator species have different  
15 foraging behaviour and pollen transfer efficiencies and therefore contribute to variation in  
16 selfing rates (Morinaga *et al.*, 2003; Brunet & Sweet, 2006; Matsuki *et al.*, 2008; but see  
17 Eckert, 2002). Mutualistic interaction networks are also characterized by their nestedness (see  
18 glossary), which implies asymmetric relationships between plant and pollinator species:  
19 specialist plant (respectively pollinator) species interact (more often) with generalist  
20 pollinator (respectively plant) species (Bascompte *et al.*, 2003; Thébault & Fontaine, 2010).  
21 This architecture determines the level of interferences among specialist plant species because  
22 of shared (generalist) pollinators, and among specialist pollinator species because of shared  
23 (generalist) plant species. The combination of all interference components determines the  
24 number of pollinator visits per plant and the quantity of heterospecific, outcross and self-

1 pollen deposited per pollinator visit, hence immediate ecological selfing rates (Wilcock &  
2 Neiland, 2002; Vanbergen *et al.*, 2014).

3 In pollinator-sharing plant species, the rate of heterospecific vs. conspecific outcross  
4 pollen transfer is governed by the floral constancy of pollinators (Ashman & Arceo-Gomez,  
5 2013 and see glossary). Within-bout floral constancy of individual pollinators is likely to  
6 maintain high outcrossing rates by increasing the relative amount of conspecific vs.  
7 heterospecific pollen deposited on stigmas. We are unaware of any experimental study of this  
8 relationship between floral constancy and selfing rates, but floral constancy is influenced by  
9 the structure of both plant and pollinator communities, which should contribute to variation in  
10 the selfing rate of a given plant species among communities. Similarities in floral traits among  
11 plant species of a community tend to lower floral constancy: de Jager *et al.* (2011) observed  
12 higher probabilities of pollinators switching between co-occurring *Oxalis* species of similar  
13 colour. Conversely, Gegear & Lavery (2001, 2005) predicted and verified experimentally  
14 that the diversity of plant species in a community increases floral constancy, particularly  
15 when plant species differ in multiple floral traits. Interference among pollinators in a  
16 community can also alter floral constancy, and thus the amount of outcross pollination. For  
17 example, experimental removal of an abundant pollinator caused weaker interspecific  
18 competition for food resources among the remaining pollinator species, which decreased their  
19 floral constancy, thus plant seed set, in natural populations of *Delphinium barbeyi* (Brosi &  
20 Briggs, 2013); the consequences on selfing rates were however not examined.

21 In addition to heterospecific pollen transfer, interference among (specialist) plant  
22 species sharing pollinators also impacts pollinator visitation rates, with two contrasting  
23 patterns: (1) decreased visitation rates (competition), caused by a combination of higher  
24 density of competitor plants and higher pollinator preference for competitor plants (Rathcke,  
25 1983; Vamosi *et al.*, 2006; Flanagan *et al.*, 2011), and (2) increased visitation rates

1 (facilitation), resulting from more effective attraction cues, maintenance of larger populations  
2 of pollinators (Sargent & Ackerly, 2008; Liao *et al.*, 2011), or availability of complementary  
3 resources for pollinators (Ghazoul, 2006). Competitive and facilitative interactions influence  
4 selfing rates because they control the amount of outcross pollen deposited on stigmas  
5 (Vamosi *et al.*, 2006; Alonso *et al.*, 2010). Which of these predominates among plant species  
6 likely depends on phylogenetic distances among species (facilitation is more likely among  
7 closely related species, Moeller, 2004; Schuett & Vamosi, 2010; Sargent *et al.*, 2011) and the  
8 overlapping of population flowering phenologies within (Fründ *et al.*, 2011) and among days  
9 (Motten, 1986; Devaux & Lande, 2009; Runquist, 2013).

10 Predicting how heterospecific pollen transfer and competition for pollinator visitation  
11 jointly impact plant mating is straightforward: both mechanisms cause conspecific outcross  
12 pollen limitation, which should be associated with increased selfing. Only a couple of studies  
13 have demonstrated increased (ecological) selfing rates due to competition for pollinators: in  
14 *Mimulus ringens* (Bell *et al.*, 2005) and *Laguncularia racemosa* (Landry, 2013). At broader  
15 time scales, highly selfing populations of *Arenaria uniflora* are thought to have evolved to  
16 avoid competition with *A. glabra* (Fishman & Wyatt, 1999). In contrast, the effect of  
17 pollinator sharing on selfing rates in plant species with facilitative interactions is less  
18 intuitive, because heterospecific pollen transfer and increased pollinator visitation rates  
19 should compensate one another. In *Clarkia* communities characterized by facilitative  
20 interactions, increased autonomous selfing is selected for under low plant species diversity  
21 (Moeller & Geber, 2005), which suggests weak outcross pollen limitation and limited impacts  
22 of heterospecific pollen transfer in highly diverse plant communities. The negative effects of  
23 heterospecific pollen transfer can be avoided by increased floral constancy of pollinators  
24 (Gegear & Laverly, 2005), separate pollen placement on pollinator bodies (Waser, 1978;

1 Huang & Shi, 2013 and references therein) or higher tolerance to heterospecific pollen  
2 transfer (Ashman & Arceo-Gomez, 2013).

3 Finally, we may predict lower selfing rates on average for generalist than for specialist  
4 plant species for two reasons. First, generalist plant species should receive more independent  
5 visits by pollinators, which should deposit larger amounts of outcross pollen. In a nested  
6 network, a significant fraction of this outcross pollen may however be heterospecific, because  
7 generalist plant species are visited by specialist as well as generalist pollinators. Fang &  
8 Huang (2013) for example observed higher rates of heterospecific pollen transfer in generalist  
9 vs. specialist plants. Heterospecific pollen transfers may explain why the general negative  
10 relationship between pollinator diversity and outcross pollen limitation remains weak (Davila  
11 *et al.*, 2012). Second, interference among pollinators can alter pollinator behaviour within  
12 plants, thereby influencing selfing rates via geitonogamous pollen transfer. Optimal foraging  
13 selects for pollinators that leave plants before interacting with competitors and predators.  
14 Hence, generalist plant species could exhibit lower geitonogamous selfing rates because  
15 interference among multiple pollinator species is likely to reduce the number of flowers each  
16 pollinator probes on a plant. One experimental study provides indirect support for this  
17 phenomenon: Greenleaf & Kremen (2006) showed that in sunflower (*Helianthus annuus*)  
18 fields containing male-fertile and male-sterile individuals, honey bees that interacted with  
19 wild bees on male-sterile plants flowers were more likely to switch to a male-fertile plant than  
20 when they interacted with a conspecific, thereby enhancing pollen transfer among individuals.  
21 Further investigation is needed to confirm or rule out the prediction of larger outcrossing rates  
22 in generalist vs. specialist plant species, for which at present there is little direct experimental  
23 evidence.

24 There is thus mounting evidence that the architecture of plant-pollinator networks can  
25 contribute to plant selfing rates and their evolution (Fig. 1). Experimental data are however

1 needed to explore the relationship between selfing rates and network architecture, particularly  
2 plant specialization to pollinators (see glossary), and broaden our understanding of the  
3 underlying mechanisms. Particularly, quantified plant-pollinator networks are crucial for an  
4 accurate assessment of plant specialization (Ings *et al.*, 2009). Note however that most  
5 networks are based on visitation data, which may not be representative of actual pollen  
6 transfer networks (Alarcón, 2010; King *et al.*, 2013). We also need reliable estimates of  
7 selfing rates, based on genetic markers for plant species of the same network (David *et al.*,  
8 2007), to document the community-level distribution of plant selfing rates, now only available  
9 in different ecological contexts (Goodwillie *et al.*, 2005). As a first step, selfing rates could be  
10 regressed on specialization (number of visiting pollinator species) across all plant species of a  
11 given plant-pollinator network at a given time. Alternatively, analyses could focus on a single  
12 or a few plant species and make use of the documented spatial or temporal variation in  
13 mutualistic networks. For example, Vanbergen *et al.* (2014) estimated the selfing rate of  
14 *Cirsium palustre* and characterized plant-pollinator networks across a gradient of grazing  
15 intensity. They observed higher selfing rates, associated with less densely connected  
16 networks, in ungrazed vs. intensively grazed habitats. However, for a given grazing intensity,  
17 selfing rates were positively related to network connectance. No general conclusion can be  
18 drawn from this single study with conflicting patterns, but the work of Vanbergen *et al.*  
19 (2014) does confirm that the architecture of plant-pollinator networks impacts plant selfing  
20 rates.

21 Finally, studies of pollinator floral constancy are still rare: existing data deal with the  
22 specialization of pollinator species only, whereas floral constancy is defined at the individual  
23 level. Floral constancy and specialization can overlap (a pollinator species specialized on a  
24 single plant species can only be constant), but remain distinct features of pollinator behaviour  
25 (a generalist pollinator can be or not constant within a foraging bout, see glossary). Hence, we



1 believe that pollinator specialization is informative to study the dynamics of plant-pollinator  
2 networks, but not to understand realized pollination patterns at the network level. Estimates of  
3 floral constancy should ideally quantify the probability of pollinator switching, and go beyond  
4 binomial classifications (in/fidelity, as in Brosi & Briggs, 2013).

### 5 ***The influence of plant mating systems on plant-pollinator network architecture***

6 Evolutionary changes in selfing rates, particularly autonomous selfing, may in the short-term  
7 involve minor modifications of floral traits (e.g. herkogamy, Webb & Lloyd, 1986), and have  
8 little consequence for pollinator visitation rates and patterns. In the long term however, they  
9 can induce more conspicuous changes and dramatically reduce pollinator visits, e.g. via a  
10 decrease in floral size, nectar and scent production, or pollen/ovule ratio (Sicard & Lenhard,  
11 2011), which could eventually alter the architecture of plant-pollinator networks. Few studies  
12 so far have examined how plant mating systems shape plant-pollinator networks, with the  
13 exception of Ollerton *et al.* (2006) and Davila *et al.* (2012), who found no difference in plant  
14 specialization between self-compatible and self-incompatible species (a qualitative approach).  
15 Yet, comparing self-compatible and self-incompatible species may not be appropriate to  
16 detect a relationship between plant specialization and selfing rate, because self-compatible  
17 species exhibit a wide range of selfing rates, from complete outcrossing to complete selfing  
18 (Goodwillie *et al.*, 2005).

19 We present here a preliminary analysis that corroborates our prediction that  
20 predominantly selfing species should be visited by fewer pollinator species than  
21 predominantly outcrossing species. For this analysis, we brought together data on plant  
22 mating system from the Bioflor database (Klotz *et al.*, 2002) with three published networks  
23 providing qualitative or quantitative plant-pollinator interactions: a forest understory  
24 (Robertson, 1929), a meadow (Memmott, 1999) and the Norwood farm (Pocock *et al.*, 2012)  
25 networks. The same tendency of fewer pollinator species on predominantly selfing plant

1 species is observed across the three networks (Fig. 4), although differences among the mating  
2 system classes are not all significant. A higher diversity of pollinator species on outcrossing  
3 species can result from two non-exclusive phenomena: a lower visitation rate to highly selfing  
4 species, which is mechanically associated with fewer pollinator species via a sampling effect,  
5 and a higher “true” specialization of selfing plant species.

6       This example emphasizes the need for quantified interaction networks, to separate the  
7 contributions to plant specialization due to overall pollinator (or plant) abundance vs.  
8 diversity of visiting pollinator species. Several authors (e.g. Blüthgen *et al.*, 2007) have  
9 stressed the influence of plant or pollinator abundance on the measurement of specialization,  
10 but specialization is still frequently measured as a number of species, so that highly-selfing  
11 plant species receiving few visits may be mistaken for extremely specialist species. In the two  
12 quantified networks available here the number of pollinator species was always strongly and  
13 significantly correlated with the total number of visits on a plant (not shown). There was also  
14 a tendency, although not significant, for fewer visits to highly-selfing plant species vs. highly-  
15 outcrossing plant species. When controlling for the effect of the number of visits a residual  
16 effect of mating system on the number of pollinator species remained, but only in the  
17 Norwood network for which predominantly outcrossing plant species were visited by a higher  
18 diversity of pollinators.

19       This analysis has several shortcomings (crude classification of plant mating systems,  
20 single trait approach ignoring correlates of mating systems that may also influence plant-  
21 pollinator interactions, species considered as independent samples, etc.), and does not provide  
22 a causal relationship between plant selfing rates and the plant-pollination networks. However,  
23 it offers new research directions, both theoretical and experimental, to understand the  
24 contribution of plant mating systems to the architecture of plant-pollinator networks.

25

1 **CONCLUDING REMARKS**

2 The study of plant mating systems in plant-pollinator networks is still in its infancy, but there  
3 is already conclusive evidence that ecological plant selfing rates and their evolution are  
4 shaped by conflicts of interest between plants and their pollinators, and by interactions  
5 between pollinator behaviour and plant mating systems at the network level. The relative  
6 contribution of such ecological constraints vs. genetic drivers to the evolution of plant mating  
7 systems, as well as the role of temporal variation in plant-pollinator networks, remains largely  
8 unknown and should be explored both empirically and theoretically. Regardless of what  
9 drives the evolution of plant selfing rates, it is associated with changes in floral traits, as is the  
10 case in the selfing syndrome: the consequences of plant mating system evolution on the  
11 architecture of plant-pollinator networks is another topic that warrants further investigation.

12

13 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

14 We thank Colin Fontaine and Russell Lande for insightful discussions and suggestions,  
15 François Ory for drawings used in Fig. 1, as well as two anonymous reviewers who helped  
16 improved an earlier version of the manuscript. This work was supported by the Region Nord-  
17 Pas-de-Calais grant to C.L, by the French CNRS program PICS grant #5273 to E.P. and by a  
18 grant from the Balzan Foundation.

19

1   **REFERENCES**

- 2   Alarcón, R. 2010. Congruence between visitation and pollen-transport networks in a  
3       California plant–pollinator community. *Oikos* **119**: 35–44.
- 4   Alonso, C., Vamosi, J.C., Knight, T.M., Steets, J.A. & Ashman, T.-L. 2010. Is reproduction  
5       of endemic plant species particularly pollen limited in biodiversity hotspots? *Oikos* **119**:  
6       1192–1200.
- 7   Anderson, B., Midgley, J.J. & Stewart, B.A. 2003. Facilitated selfing offers reproductive  
8       assurance: A mutualism between a hemipteran and carnivorous plant. *Am. J. Bot.* **90**:  
9       1009–1015.
- 10   Ashman, T.-L. & Arceo-Gomez, G. 2013. Toward a predictive understanding of the fitness  
11       costs of heterospecific pollen receipt and its importance in co-flowering communities.  
12       *Am. J. Bot.* **100**: 1061–1070.
- 13   Ashman, T.L., Knight, T.M., Steets, J.A., Amarasekare, P., Burd, M., Campbell, D.R., *et al.*  
14       2004. Pollen limitation of plant reproduction: ecological and evolutionary causes and  
15       consequences. *Ecology* **85**: 2408–2421.
- 16   Ashman, T.L. & Majetic, C.J. 2006. Genetic constraints on floral evolution: a review and  
17       evaluation of patterns. *Heredity* **96**: 343–352.
- 18   Bailey, S.F., Hargreaves, A.L., Hechtenthal, S.D., Laird, R.A., Latty, T.M., Reid, T.G., *et al.*  
19       2007. Empty flowers as a pollination-enhancement strategy. *Evol. Ecol. Res.* **9**: 1245–  
20       1262.
- 21   Barrett, S.C.H. 2003. Mating strategies in flowering plants: the outcrossing–selfing paradigm  
22       and beyond. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. B - Biol. Sci.* **358**: 991–1004.
- 23   Bartomeus, I., Ascher, J.S., Wagner, D., Danforth, B.N., Colla, S., Kornbluth, S., *et al.* 2011.  
24       Climate-associated phenological advances in bee pollinators and bee-pollinated plants.  
25       *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **108**: 20645–20649.

- 1 Bascompte, J., Jordano, P., Melian, C.J. & Olesen, J.M. 2003. The nested assembly of plant-  
2 animal mutualistic networks. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **100**: 9383–9387.
- 3 Bell, J.M., Karron, J.D. & Mitchell, R.J. 2005. Interspecific competition for pollination  
4 lowers seed production and outcrossing in *Mimulus ringens*. *Ecology* **86**: 762–771.
- 5 Best, L.S. & Bierzychudek, P. 1982. Pollinator foraging on foxglove (*Digitalis purpurea*): a  
6 test of a new model. *Evolution* **36**: 70–79.
- 7 Blüthgen, N., Menzel, F., Hovestadt, T., Fiala, B. & Bluethgen, N. 2007. Specialization,  
8 constraints, and conflicting interests in mutualistic networks. *Curr. Biol.* **17**: 341–346.
- 9 Bobdyl Roels, S.A. & Kelly, J.K. 2011. Rapid evolution caused by pollinator loss in *Mimulus*  
10 *guttatus*. *Evolution* **65**: 2541–2552.
- 11 Brandenburg, A., Kuhlemeier, C. & Bshary, R. 2012. Hawkmoth pollinators decrease seed set  
12 of a low-nectar *Petunia axillaris* line through reduced probing time. *Curr. Biol.* **22**:  
13 1635–1639.
- 14 Bronstein, J.L. 2001. The exploitation of mutualisms. *Ecol. Lett.* **4**: 277–287.
- 15 Brosi, B.J. & Briggs, H.M. 2013. Single pollinator species losses reduce floral fidelity and  
16 plant reproductive function. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **110**: 13044–13048.
- 17 Brunet, J. & Eckert, C.G. 1998. Effects of floral morphology and display on outcrossing in  
18 Blue Columbine, *Aquilegia caerulea* (Ranunculaceae). *Funct. Ecol.* **12**: 596–606.
- 19 Brunet, J. & Sweet, H.R. 2006. Impact of insect pollinator group and floral display size on  
20 outcrossing rate. *Evolution* **60**: 234–246.
- 21 Buchmann, S.L. & Nabhan, G.P. 1996. *The forgotten pollinators*. Island Press [for]  
22 Shearwater Books, Washington, D.C.
- 23 Castellanos, M.C., Wilson, P. & Thomson, J.D. 2003. Pollen transfer by hummingbirds and  
24 bumblebees, and the divergence of pollination modes in *Penstemon*. *Evolution* **57**:  
25 2742–2752.

- 1 Charlesworth, D. 2006. Evolution of plant breeding systems. *Curr. Biol.* **16**: R726–R735.
- 2 Charlesworth, D. 2013. Plant sex chromosome evolution. *J. Exp. Bot.* **64**: 405–420.
- 3 Charlesworth, D., Morgan, M.T. & Charlesworth, B. 1990. Inbreeding depression, genetic  
4 load, and the evolution of outcrossing rates in a multilocus system with no linkage.  
5 *Evolution* **44**: 1469–1489.
- 6 Charlesworth, D. & Willis, J.H. 2009. The genetics of inbreeding depression. *Nat. Rev. Genet.*  
7 **10**: 783–796.
- 8 Cheptou, P. & Schoen, D. 2002. The cost of fluctuating inbreeding depression. *Evolution* **56**:  
9 1059–1062.
- 10 Cheptou, P.O. 2004. Allee effect and self-fertilization in hermaphrodites: Reproductive  
11 assurance in demographically stable populations. *Evolution* **58**: 2613–2621.
- 12 Chittka, L., Thomson, J.D. & Waser, N.M. 1999. Flower constancy, insect psychology, and  
13 plant evolution. *Naturwissenschaften* **86**: 361–377.
- 14 Cock, M. 1978. Assessment of preference. *J. Anim. Ecol.* **47**: 805–816.
- 15 Conner, J., Davis, R. & Rush, S. 1995. The effect of wild radish floral morphology on  
16 pollination efficiency by four taxa of pollinators. *Oecologia* **104**: 234–245.
- 17 Cozzolino, S. & Scopece, G. 2008. Specificity in pollination and consequences for postmating  
18 reproductive isolation in deceptive Mediterranean orchids. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. B-*  
19 *Biol. Sci.* **363**: 3037–3046.
- 20 Cresswell, J.E. 1997. Spatial heterogeneity, pollinator behaviour and pollinator-mediated gene  
21 flow: Bumblebee movements in variously aggregated rows of oil-seed rape. *Oikos* **78**:  
22 546–556.
- 23 Culley, T.M. & Klooster, M.R. 2007. The cleistogamous breeding system: a review of its  
24 frequency, evolution, and ecology in angiosperms. *Bot. Rev.* **73**: 1–30.

- 1 David, P., Pujol, B., Viard, F., Castella, V. & Goudet, J. 2007. Reliable selfing rate estimates  
2 from imperfect population genetic data. *Mol. Ecol.* **16**: 2474–2487.
- 3 Davila, Y.C., Elle, E., Vamosi, J.C., Hermanutz, L., Kerr, J.T., Lortie, C.J., *et al.* 2012.  
4 Ecosystem services of pollinator diversity: a review of the relationship with pollen  
5 limitation of plant reproduction. *Botany* **90**: 535–543.
- 6 De Jager, M.L., Dreyer, L.L. & Ellis, A.G. 2011. Do pollinators influence the assembly of  
7 flower colours within plant communities? *Oecologia* **166**: 543–553.
- 8 De Jong, T. & Klinkhamer, P. 2005. *Evolutionary ecology of plant reproductive strategies*.  
9 Cambridge University Press.
- 10 De Jong, T.J., Klinkhamer, P. & Vanstaalduinen, M. 1992. The consequences of pollination  
11 biology for selection of mass or extended blooming. *Funct. Ecol.* **6**: 606–615.
- 12 De Jong, T.J., Waser, N. & Klinkhamer, P. 1993. Geitonogamy: the neglected side of selfing.  
13 *Trends Ecol. Evol.* **8**: 321–325.
- 14 Devaux, C. & Lande, R. 2009. Displacement of flowering phenologies among plant species  
15 by competition for generalist pollinators. *J. Evol. Biol.* **22**: 1460–1470.
- 16 Devaux, C. & Lande, R. 2010. Selection on variance in flowering time within and among  
17 individuals. *Evolution* **64**: 1311–1320.
- 18 Duan, Y.W., He, Y.P. & Liu, J.Q. 2005. Reproductive ecology of the Qinghai-Tibet Plateau  
19 endemic *Gentiana straminea* (Gentianaceae), a hermaphrodite perennial characterized  
20 by herkogamy and dichogamy. *Acta Oecologica-Int. J. Ecol.* **27**: 225–232.
- 21 Dufay, M. & Anstett, M.C. 2003. Conflicts between plants and pollinators that reproduce  
22 within inflorescences: evolutionary variations on a theme. *Oikos* **100**: 3–14.
- 23 Duncan, D.H., Nicotra, A.B. & Cunningham, S.A. 2004. High self-pollen transfer and low  
24 fruit set in buzz-pollinated *Dianella revoluta* (Phormiaceae). *Aust. J. Bot.* **52**: 185–193.

- 1 Eckert, C.G. 2002. Effect of geographical variation in pollinator fauna on the mating system  
2 of *Decodon verticillatus* (Lythraceae). *Int. J. Plant Sci.* **163**: 123–132.
- 3 Eckert, C.G., Kalisz, S., Geber, M.A., Sargent, R., Elle, E., Cheptou, P.-O., *et al.* 2010. Plant  
4 mating systems in a changing world. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* **25**: 35–43.
- 5 Elzinga, J.A., Atlan, A., Biere, A., Gigord, L., Weis, A.E. & Bernasconi, G. 2007. Time after  
6 time: flowering phenology and biotic interactions. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* **22**: 432–439.
- 7 Fang, Q. & Huang, S.-Q. 2013. A directed network analysis of heterospecific pollen transfer  
8 in a biodiverse community. *Ecology* **94**: 1176–1185.
- 9 Fenster, C.B., Armbruster, W.S., Wilson, P., Dudash, M.R. & Thomson, J.D. 2004.  
10 Pollination syndromes and floral specialization. *Annu. Rev. Ecol. Evol. Syst.* **35**: 375–  
11 403.
- 12 Ferdy, J.B. & Smithson, A. 2002. Geitonogamy in rewarding and unrewarding inflorescences:  
13 modelling pollen transfer on actual foraging sequences. *Evol. Ecol.* **16**: 155–175.
- 14 Fisher, R.A. 1941. Average excess and average effect of a gene substitution. *Ann. Eugen.* **11**:  
15 53–63.
- 16 Fishman, L. & Wyatt, R. 1999. Pollinator-mediated competition, reproductive character  
17 displacement, and the evolution of selfing in *Arenaria uniflora* (Caryophyllaceae).  
18 *Evolution* **53**: 1723–1733.
- 19 Flanagan, R.J., Mitchell, R.J. & Karron, J.D. 2011. Effects of multiple competitors for  
20 pollination on bumblebee foraging patterns and *Mimulus ringens* reproductive success.  
21 *Oikos* **120**: 200–207.
- 22 Friedman, J. & Barrett, S.C.H. 2009. Wind of change: new insights on the ecology and  
23 evolution of pollination and mating in wind-pollinated plants. *Ann. Bot.* **103**: 1515–  
24 1527.



- 1 Fründ, J., Dormann, C.F. & Tschardtke, T. 2011. Linne's floral clock is slow without  
2 pollinators: flower closure and plant-pollinator interaction webs. *Ecol. Lett.* **14**: 896–  
3 904.
- 4 Galliot, C., Hoballah, M.E., Kuhlemeier, C. & Stuurman, J. 2006. Genetics of flower size and  
5 nectar volume in *Petunia* pollination syndromes. *Planta* **225**: 203–212.
- 6 Garcia-Jacas, N., Susanna, A., Garnatje, T. & Vilatersana, R. 2001. Generic delimitation and  
7 phylogeny of the subtribe *Centaureinae* (Asteraceae): A combined nuclear and  
8 chloroplast DNA analysis. *Ann. Bot.* **87**: 503–515.
- 9 Geber, M. 1985. The relationship of plant size to self-pollination in *Mertensia ciliata*.  
10 *Ecology* **66**: 762–772.
- 11 Geber, M.A. & Griffen, L.R. 2003. Inheritance and natural selection on functional traits. *Int.*  
12 *J. Plant Sci.* **164**: S21–S42.
- 13 Gegear, R.J. & Lavery, T.M. 2005. Flower constancy in bumblebees: a test of the trait  
14 variability hypothesis. *Anim. Behav.* **69**: 939–949.
- 15 Gegear, R.J. & Lavery, T.M. 2001. The effect of variation among floral traits on the flower  
16 constancy of pollinators. In: *Cognitive ecology of pollination: animal behavior and*  
17 *flora evolution*, pp. 1–20. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- 18 Ghazoul, J. 2006. Floral diversity and the facilitation of pollination. *J. Ecol.* **94**: 295–304.
- 19 Goldberg, E.E., Kohn, J.R., Lande, R., Robertson, K.A., Smith, S.A. & Iqic, B. 2010. Species  
20 selection maintains self-incompatibility. *Science* **330**: 493–495.
- 21 Gonzalez-Varo, J.P., Biesmeijer, J.C., Bommarco, R., Potts, S.G., Schweiger, O., Smith,  
22 H.G., *et al.* 2013. Combined effects of global change pressures on animal-mediated  
23 pollination. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* **28**: 524–530.
- 24 Goodwillie, C., Kalisz, S. & Eckert, C.G. 2005. The evolutionary enigma of mixed mating  
25 systems in plants: Occurrence, theoretical explanations, and empirical evidence. In:

- 1        *Annual Review of Ecology Evolution and Systematics*, pp. 47–79. Annual Reviews, Palo  
2        Alto.
- 3        Goodwillie, C., Sargent, R.D., Eckert, C.G., Elle, E., Geber, M.A., Johnston, M.O., *et al.*  
4        2010. Correlated evolution of mating system and floral display traits in flowering plants  
5        and its implications for the distribution of mating system variation. *New Phytol.* **185**:  
6        311–321.
- 7        Greenleaf, S.S. & Kremen, C. 2006. Wild bees enhance honey bees' pollination of hybrid  
8        sunflower. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **103**: 13890–13895.
- 9        Harder, L.D. 1990. Behavioral responses by bumble bees to variation in pollen availability.  
10        *Oecologia* **85**: 41–47.
- 11        Harder, L.D. & Barrett, S.C.H. 2006. *Ecology and Evolution of Flowers*. OUP Oxford.
- 12        Harder, L.D. & Barrett, S.C.H. 1996. Pollen dispersal and mating patterns in animal-  
13        pollinated plants. In: *Floral Biology. Studies on floral evolution in animal-pollinated*  
14        *plants*, pp. 140–190. Chapman and Hall, New-York.
- 15        Harder, L.D., Barrett, S.C.H. & Cole, W.W. 2000. The mating consequences of sexual  
16        segregation within inflorescences of flowering plants. *Proc. R. Soc. Lond. B Biol. Sci.*  
17        **267**: 315–320.
- 18        Harder, L.D. & Johnson, S.D. 2005. Adaptive plasticity of floral display size in animal-  
19        pollinated plants. *Proc. R. Soc. B-Biol. Sci.* **272**: 2651–2657.
- 20        Harder, L.D., Jordan, C.Y., Gross, W.E. & Routley, M.B. 2004. Beyond floricism: The  
21        pollination function of inflorescences. *Plant Species Biol.* **19**: 137–148.
- 22        Hirabayashi, Y., Ishii, H.S. & Kudo, G. 2006. Significance of nectar distribution for  
23        bumblebee behaviour within inflorescences, with reference to inflorescence architecture  
24        and display size. *Ecoscience* **13**: 351–359.

- 1 Holmquist, K.G., Mitchell, R.J. & Karron, J.D. 2012. Influence of pollinator grooming on  
2 pollen-mediated gene dispersal in *Mimulus ringens* (Phrymaceae). *Plant Species Biol.*  
3 **27**: 77–85.
- 4 Huang, S.-Q. & Shi, X.-Q. 2013. Floral isolation in *Pedicularis*: how do congeners with  
5 shared pollinators minimize reproductive interference? *New Phytol.* **199**: 858–865.
- 6 Husband, B.C. & Schemske, D.W. 1996. Evolution of the magnitude and timing of inbreeding  
7 depression in plants. *Evolution* **50**: 54–70.
- 8 Igc, B. & Kohn, J.R. 2006. The distribution of plant mating systems: Study bias against  
9 obligately outcrossing species. *Evolution* **60**: 1098–1103.
- 10 Ings, T.C., Montoya, J.M., Bascompte, J., Blüthgen, N., Brown, L., Dormann, C.F., *et al.*  
11 2009. Review: Ecological networks – beyond food webs. *J. Anim. Ecol.* **78**: 253–269.
- 12 Ishii, H.S. & Harder, L.D. 2006. The size of individual *Delphinium* flowers and the  
13 opportunity for geitonogamous pollination. *Funct. Ecol.* **20**: 1115–1123.
- 14 Ito, E. & Kikuzawa, K. 2003. Reduction of geitonogamy: Flower abscission for departure of  
15 pollinators. *Ecol. Res.* **18**: 177–183.
- 16 Iwata, T., Nagasaki, O., Ishii, H.S. & Ushimaru, A. 2012. Inflorescence architecture affects  
17 pollinator behaviour and mating success in *Spiranthes sinensis* (Orchidaceae). *New*  
18 *Phytol.* **193**: 196–203.
- 19 Johnson, S.D., Neal, P.R. & Harder, L.D. 2005. Pollen fates and the limits on male  
20 reproductive success in an orchid population. *Biol. J. Linn. Soc.* **86**: 175–190.
- 21 Johnston, M.O. 1998. Evolution of intermediate selfing rates in plants: pollination ecology  
22 versus deleterious mutations. *Genetica* **102-3**: 267–278.
- 23 Johnston, M.O., Porcher, E., Cheptou, P.-O., Eckert, C.G., Elle, E., Geber, M.A., *et al.* 2009.  
24 Correlations among fertility components can maintain mixed mating in plants. *Am. Nat.*  
25 **173**: 1–11.

- 1 Jordan, C.Y. & Harder, L.D. 2006. Manipulation of bee behavior by inflorescence  
2 architecture and its consequences for plant mating. *Am. Nat.* **167**: 496–509.
- 3 Jordan, C.Y. & Otto, S.P. 2012. Functional pleiotropy and mating system evolution in plants:  
4 frequency-independent mating. *Evolution* **66**: 957–972.
- 5 Junker, R.R., Blüthgen, N., Brehm, T., Binkenstein, J., Paulus, J., Schaefer, H.M., *et al.* 2013.  
6 Specialization on traits as basis for the niche-breadth of flower visitors and as  
7 structuring mechanism of ecological networks. *Funct. Ecol.* **27**: 329–341.
- 8 Karron, J.D., Holmquist, K.G., Flanagan, R.J. & Mitchell, R.J. 2009. Pollinator visitation  
9 patterns strongly influence among-flower variation in selfing rate. *Ann. Bot.* **103**: 1379–  
10 1383.
- 11 Karron, J.D., Ivey, C.T., Mitchell, R.J., Whitehead, M.R., Peakall, R. & Case, A.L. 2012.  
12 New perspectives on the evolution of plant mating systems. *Ann. Bot.* **109**: 493–503.
- 13 Karron, J.D., Jackson, R.T., Thumser, N.N. & Schlicht, S.L. 1997. Outcrossing rates of  
14 individual *Mimulus ringens* genets are correlated with anther-stigma separation.  
15 *Heredity* **79**: 365–370.
- 16 Karron, J.D. & Mitchell, R.J. 2012. Effects of floral display size on male and female  
17 reproductive success in *Mimulus ringens*. *Ann. Bot.* **109**: 563–570.
- 18 Karron, J.D., Mitchell, R.J., Holmquist, K.G., Bell, J.M. & Funk, B. 2004. The influence of  
19 floral display size on selfing rates in *Mimulus ringens*. *Heredity* **92**: 242–248.
- 20 Keasar, T., Sadeh, A., Gerchman, Y. & Shmida, A. 2009. The signaling function of an extra-  
21 floral display: what selects for signal development? *Oikos* **118**: 1752–1759.
- 22 Kiestler, A., Lande, R. & Schemske, D. 1984. Models of coevolution and speciation in plants  
23 and their pollinators. *Am. Nat.* **124**: 220–243.

- 1 King, C., Ballantyne, G. & Willmer, P.G. 2013. Why flower visitation is a poor proxy for  
2 pollination: measuring single-visit pollen deposition, with implications for pollination  
3 networks and conservation. *Methods Ecol. Evol.* **4**: 811–818.
- 4 Kingsolver, J.G., Hoekstra, H.E., Hoekstra, J.M., Berrigan, D., Vignieri, S.N., Hill, C.E., *et*  
5 *al.* 2001. The strength of phenotypic selection in natural populations. *Am. Nat.* **157**:  
6 245–261.
- 7 Klotz, S., Kühn, I. & Durka, W. 2002. Bioflor: Eine Datenbank zu biologisch-ökologischen  
8 Merkmalen der Gefäßpflanzen in Deutschland. In: *Schriftenreihe für Vegetationskunde*.  
9 Bundesamt für Naturschutz, Bonn, Germany.
- 10 Knight, T.M., Steets, J.A., Vamosi, J.C., Mazer, S.J., Burd, M., Campbell, D.R., *et al.* 2005.  
11 Pollen limitation of plant reproduction: Pattern and process. In: *Annual Review of*  
12 *Ecology Evolution and Systematics*, pp. 467–497. Annual Reviews, Palo Alto.
- 13 Kondrashov, A.S. 1985. Deleterious mutations as an evolutionary factor. 2. Facultative  
14 apomixis and selfing. *Genetics* **111**: 635–653.
- 15 Lande, R. & Schemske, D.W. 1985. The evolution of self-fertilization and inbreeding  
16 depression in plants. 1. Genetic models. *Evolution* **39**: 24–40.
- 17 Lande, R., Schemske, D.W. & Schultz, S.T. 1994. High inbreeding depression, selective  
18 interference among loci, and the threshold selfing rate for purging recessive lethal  
19 mutations. *Evolution* **48**: 965–978.
- 20 Landry, C.L. 2013. Pollinator-mediated competition between two co-flowering Neotropical  
21 mangrove species, *Avicennia germinans* (Avicenniaceae) and *Laguncularia racemosa*  
22 (Combretaceae). *Ann. Bot.* **111**: 207–214.
- 23 Liao, K., Gituru, R.W., Guo, Y.-H. & Wang, Q.-F. 2011. The presence of co-flowering  
24 species facilitates reproductive success of *Pedicularis monbeigiana* (Orobanchaceae)  
25 through variation in bumble-bee foraging behaviour. *Ann. Bot.* **108**: 877–884.

- 1 Lloyd, D. 1979. Some reproductive factors affecting the selection of self-fertilization. *Am.*  
2 *Nat.* **113**: 67–79.
- 3 Lloyd, D. & Schoen, D. 1992. Self-fertilization and cross-fertilization in plants. 1. Functional  
4 dimensions. *Int. J. Plant Sci.* **153**: 358–369.
- 5 Lloyd, D.G. 1992. Self-fertilization and cross-fertilization in plants. 2. The selection of self-  
6 fertilization. *Int. J. Plant Sci.* **153**: 370–380.
- 7 Lloyd, D.G. & Webb, C.J. 1986. The avoidance of interference between the presentation of  
8 pollen and stigmas in Angiosperms. 1. Dichogamy. *N. Z. J. Bot.* **24**: 135–162.
- 9 Masuda, M., Yahara, T. & Maki, M. 2001. An ESS model for the mixed production of  
10 cleistogamous and chasmogamous flowers in a facultative cleistogamous plant. *Evol.*  
11 *Ecol. Res.* **3**: 429–439.
- 12 Masuda, M., Yahara, T. & Maki, M. 2004. Evolution of floral dimorphism in a cleistogamous  
13 annual, *Impatiens noli-tangere* L. occurring under different environmental conditions.  
14 *Ecol. Res.* **19**: 571–580.
- 15 Matsuki, Y., Tateno, R., Shibata, M. & Isag, Y. 2008. Pollination efficiencies of flower-  
16 visiting insects as determined by direct genetic analysis of pollen origin. *Am. J. Bot.* **95**:  
17 925–930.
- 18 Memmott, J. 1999. The structure of a plant-pollinator food web. *Ecol. Lett.* **2**: 276–280.
- 19 Mitchell, R.J., Irwin, R.E., Flanagan, R.J. & Karron, J.D. 2009. Ecology and evolution of  
20 plant-pollinator interactions. *Ann. Bot.* **103**: 1355–1363.
- 21 Mitchell, R.J., Karron, J.D., Holmquist, K.G. & Bell, J.M. 2004. The influence of *Mimulus*  
22 *ringens* floral display size on pollinator visitation patterns. *Funct. Ecol.* **18**: 116–124.
- 23 Moeller, D.A. 2004. Facilitative interactions among plants via shared pollinators. *Ecology* **85**:  
24 3289–3301.

- 1 Moeller, D.A. & Geber, M.A. 2005. Ecological context of the evolution of self-pollination in  
2 *Clarkia xantiana*: Population size, plant communities, and reproductive assurance.  
3 *Evolution* **59**: 786–799.
- 4 Morgan, M.T. & Wilson, W.G. 2005. Self-fertilization and the escape from pollen limitation  
5 in variable pollination environments. *Evolution* **59**: 1143–1148.
- 6 Morgan, M.T., Wilson, W.G. & Knight, T.M. 2005. Plant population dynamics, pollinator  
7 foraging, and the selection of self-fertilization. *Am. Nat.* **166**: 169–183.
- 8 Morinaga, S.I., Tsuji, K. & Sakai, S. 2003. Consequences of differences in flowering date on  
9 seed production in *Heloniopsis orientalis* (Liliaceae). *Am. J. Bot.* **90**: 1153–1158.
- 10 Morris, W., Price, M., Waser, N., Thomson, J., Thomson, B. & Stratton, D. 1994. Systematic  
11 increase in pollen carryover and its consequences for geitonogamy in plant populations.  
12 *Oikos* **71**: 431–440.
- 13 Motten, A. 1986. Pollination ecology of the spring wildflower community of a temperate  
14 deciduous forest. *Ecol. Monogr.* **56**: 21–42.
- 15 Mustajarvi, K., Siikamaki, P., Rytkonen, S. & Lammi, A. 2001. Consequences of plant  
16 population size and density for plant-pollinator interactions and plant performance. *J.*  
17 *Ecol.* **89**: 80–87.
- 18 Nagylaki, T. 1976. A model for the evolution of self-fertilization and vegetative reproduction.  
19 *J. Theor. Biol.* **58**: 55–58.
- 20 O’Neil, P. 1997. Natural selection on genetically correlated phenological characters in  
21 *Lythrum salicaria* L. (Lythraceae). *Evolution* **51**: 267–274.
- 22 Oakley, C.G., Moriuchi, K.S. & Winn, A.A. 2007. The maintenance of outcrossing in  
23 predominantly selfing species: Ideas and evidence from cleistogamous species. In:  
24 *Annual Review of Ecology Evolution and Systematics*, pp. 437–457. Annual Reviews,  
25 Palo Alto.

- 1 Ohashi, K. 2002. Consequences of floral complexity for bumblebee-mediated geitonogamous  
2 self-pollination in *Salvia nipponica* Miq. (Labiatae). *Evolution* **56**: 2414–2423.
- 3 Ohashi, K. & Yahara, T. 2001. Behavioural responses of pollinators to variation in floral  
4 display size and their influences on the evolution of floral traits. In: *Cognitive ecology*  
5 *of pollination*, pp. 274–296. Cambridge.
- 6 Ohashi, K. & Yahara, T. 1999. How long to stay on, and how often to visit a flowering plant?  
7 A model for foraging strategy when floral displays vary in size. *Oikos* **86**: 386–392.
- 8 Ohashi, K. & Yahara, T. 2002. Visit larger displays but probe proportionally fewer flowers:  
9 counterintuitive behaviour of nectar-collecting bumble bees achieves an ideal free  
10 distribution. *Funct. Ecol.* **16**: 492–503.
- 11 Ollerton, J., Johnson, S.D. & Hingston, A.B. 2006. Geographical variation in diversity and  
12 specificity of pollination systems. In: *Plant–pollinator interactions: from specialization*  
13 *to generalization*, pp. 411–435. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- 14 Ollerton, J., Winfree, R. & Tarrant, S. 2011. How many flowering plants are pollinated by  
15 animals? *Oikos* **120**: 321–326.
- 16 Owen, K., Vaughton, G. & Ramsey, M. 2007. Facilitated autogamy and costs of selfing in the  
17 perennial herb *Bulbine bulbosa* (Asphodelaceae). *Int. J. Plant Sci.* **168**: 579–585.
- 18 Peter, C.I. & Johnson, S.D. 2006. Anther cap retention prevents self-pollination by elaterid  
19 beetles in the South African orchid *Eulophia foliosa*. *Ann. Bot.* **97**: 345–355.
- 20 Pocock, M.J.O., Evans, D.M. & Memmott, J. 2012. The robustness and restoration of a  
21 network of ecological networks. *Science* **335**: 973–977.
- 22 Porcher, E., Kelly, J.K., Cheptou, P.-O., Eckert, C.G., Johnston, M.O. & Kalisz, S. 2009. The  
23 genetic consequences of fluctuating inbreeding depression and the evolution of plant  
24 selfing rates. *J. Evol. Biol.* **22**: 708–717.



- 1 Porcher, E. & Lande, R. 2013. Evaluating a simple approximation to modeling the joint  
2 evolution of self-fertilization and inbreeding depression. *Evolution* **In press**.
- 3 Porcher, E. & Lande, R. 2005a. Loss of gametophytic self-incompatibility with evolution of  
4 inbreeding depression. *Evolution* **59**: 46–60.
- 5 Porcher, E. & Lande, R. 2005b. The evolution of self-fertilization and inbreeding depression  
6 under pollen discounting and pollen limitation. *J. Evol. Biol.* **18**: 497–508.
- 7 Potts, S.G., Biesmeijer, J.C., Kremen, C., Neumann, P., Schweiger, O. & Kunin, W.E. 2010.  
8 Global pollinator declines: trends, impacts and drivers. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* **25**: 345–353.
- 9 Pyke, G. 1984. Optimal foraging theory: a critical-review. *Annu. Rev. Ecol. Syst.* **15**: 523–  
10 575.
- 11 Rademaker, M.C.J., de Jong, T.J. & Klinkhamer, P.G.L. 1997. Pollen dynamics of bumble-  
12 bee visitation on *Echium vulgare*. *Funct. Ecol.* **11**: 554–563.
- 13 Rademaker, M.C.J., De Jong, T.J. & Van der Meijden, E. 1999. Selfing rates in natural  
14 populations of *Echium vulgare*: a combined empirical and model approach. *Funct. Ecol.*  
15 **13**: 828–837.
- 16 Rathcke, B. 1983. Competition and facilitation among plants for pollination. In: *Pollination*  
17 *Biology* (L. Real, ed), pp. 305–329. Academic Press, New York.
- 18 Robertson, A. 1992a. The relationship between floral display size, pollen carryover and  
19 geitonogamy in *Myosotis colensoi* (kirk) Macbride (boraginaceae). *Biol. J. Linn. Soc.*  
20 **46**: 333–349.
- 21 Robertson, A. 1992b. The relationship between floral display size, pollen carryover and  
22 geitonogamy in *Myosotis colensoi* (kirk) Macbride (boraginaceae). *Biol. J. Linn. Soc.*  
23 **46**: 333–349.
- 24 Robertson, C. 1929. *Flowers and insects: lists of visitors to four hundred and fifty-three*  
25 *flowers*. Science Press Printing Company, Lancaster, PA.

- 1 Ruan, C.-J., da Silva, J.A.T. & Qin, P. 2010. Style curvature and its adaptive significance in  
2 the Malvaceae. *Plant Syst. Evol.* **288**: 13–23.
- 3 Runquist, R.B. 2013. Community phenology and its consequences for plant-pollinator  
4 interactions and pollen limitation in a vernal pool plant. *Int. J. Plant Sci.* **174**: 853–862.
- 5 Sahli, H.F. & Conner, J.K. 2007. Visitation, effectiveness, and efficiency of 15 genera of  
6 visitors to wild radish, *Raphanus raphanistrum* (Brassicaceae). *Am. J. Bot.* **94**: 203–  
7 209.
- 8 Sakai, S. & Ishii, H.S. 1999. Why be completely outcrossing? Evolutionarily stable  
9 outcrossing strategies in an environment where outcross-pollen availability is  
10 unpredictable. *Evol. Ecol. Res.* **1**: 211–222.
- 11 Sandvik, S.M. & Totland, O. 2003. Quantitative importance of staminodes for female  
12 reproductive success in *Parnassia palustris* under contrasting environmental conditions.  
13 *Can. J. Bot.-Rev. Can. Bot.* **81**: 49–56.
- 14 Sargent, R.D. & Ackerly, D.D. 2008. Plant-pollinator interactions and the assembly of plant  
15 communities. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* **23**: 123–130.
- 16 Sargent, R.D., Goodwillie, C., Kalisz, S. & Rees, R.H. 2007. Phylogenetic evidence for a  
17 flower size and number trade-off. *Am. J. Bot.* **94**: 2059–2062.
- 18 Sargent, R.D., Kembel, S.W., Emery, N.C., Forrestel, E.J. & Ackerly, D.D. 2011. Effect of  
19 local community phylogenetic structure on pollen limitation in an obligately insect-  
20 pollinated plant. *Am. J. Bot.* **98**: 283–289.
- 21 Schiestl, F.P. & Johnson, S.D. 2013. Pollinator-mediated evolution of floral signals. *Trends*  
22 *Ecol. Evol.* **28**: 307–315.
- 23 Schuett, E.M. & Vamosi, J.C. 2010. Phylogenetic community context influences pollen  
24 delivery to *Allium cernuum*. *Evol. Biol.* **37**: 19–28.

- 1 Sicard, A. & Lenhard, M. 2011. The selfing syndrome: a model for studying the genetic and  
2 evolutionary basis of morphological adaptation in plants. *Ann. Bot.* **107**: 1433–1443.
- 3 Silvertown, J. 2008. The evolutionary maintenance of sexual reproduction: Evidence from the  
4 ecological distribution of asexual reproduction in clonal plants. *Int. J. Plant Sci.* **169**:  
5 157–168.
- 6 Snow, A.A., Spira, T.P., Simpson, R. & Klips, R.A. 1996. The ecology of geitonogamous  
7 pollination. In: *Floral biology*, pp. 191–216. Springer.
- 8 Spigler, R.B. & Ashman, T.-L. 2012. Gynodioecy to dioecy: are we there yet? *Ann. Bot.* **109**:  
9 531–543.
- 10 Strauss, S.Y. & Irwin, R.E. 2004. Ecological and evolutionary consequences of multispecies  
11 plant-animal interactions. *Annu. Rev. Ecol. Evol. Syst.* **35**: 435–466.
- 12 Thébault, E. & Fontaine, C. 2010. Stability of ecological communities and the architecture of  
13 mutualistic and trophic networks. *Science* **329**: 853–856.
- 14 Thomann, M., Imbert, E., Devaux, C. & Cheptou, P.-O. 2013. Flowering plants under global  
15 pollinator decline. *Trends Plant Sci.* **18**: 353–359.
- 16 Thomson, J. 1986. Pollen transport and deposition by bumble bees in *Erythronium*: influences  
17 of floral nectar and bee grooming. *J. Ecol.* **74**: 329–341.
- 18 Vamosi, J.C., Knight, T.M., Steets, J.A., Mazer, S.J., Burd, M. & Ashman, T.L. 2006.  
19 Pollination decays in biodiversity hotspots. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **103**: 956–  
20 961.
- 21 Vanbergen, A.J., Woodcock, B.A., Gray, A., Grant, F., Telford, A., Lambdon, P., *et al.* 2014.  
22 Grazing alters insect visitation networks and plant mating systems. *Funct. Ecol.* **28**:  
23 178–189.
- 24 Vaughton, G., Ramsey, M. & Simpson, I. 2008. Does selfing provide reproductive assurance  
25 in the perennial herb *Bulbine vagans* (Asphodelaceae)? *Oikos* **117**: 390–398.

- 1 Waser, N. 1986. Flower constancy: definition, cause, and measurement. *Am. Nat.* **127**: 593–  
2 603.
- 3 Waser, N. 1978. Interspecific pollen transfer and competition between co-occurring plant  
4 species. *Oecologia* **36**: 223–236.
- 5 Webb, C.J. & Lloyd, D.G. 1986. The avoidance of interference between the presentation of  
6 pollen and stigmas in angiosperms. 2. Herkogamy. *N. Z. J. Bot.* **24**: 163–178.
- 7 Whitehead, M.R., Phillips, R.D. & Peakall, R. 2012. Pollination: the price of attraction. *Curr.*  
8 *Biol.* **22**: R680–R682.
- 9 Wilcock, C. & Neiland, R. 2002. Pollination failure in plants: why it happens and when it  
10 matters. *Trends Plant Sci.* **7**: 270–277.
- 11 Williams, C.F. 2007. Effects of floral display size and biparental inbreeding on outcrossing  
12 rates in *Delphinium barbeyi* (Ranunculaceae). *Am. J. Bot.* **94**: 1696–1705.
- 13 Winn, A.A., Elle, E., Kalisz, S., Cheptou, P.-O., Eckert, C.G., Goodwillie, C., *et al.* 2011.  
14 Analysis of inbreeding depression in mixed-mating plants provides evidence for  
15 selective interference and stable mixed mating. *Evolution* **65**: 3339–3359.
- 16 Wright, S.I., Kalisz, S. & Slotte, T. 2013. Evolutionary consequences of self-fertilization in  
17 plants. *Proc. R. Soc. B-Biol. Sci.* **280**.
- 18 Zhang, F., Hui, C. & Pauw, A. 2013. Adaptive divergence in Darwin's race: How coevolution  
19 can generate trait diversity in a pollination system. *Evolution* **67**: 548–560.
- 20

## 1 GLOSSARY

2

3 **Floral constancy** (or fidelity) refers to the propensity for an individual pollinator to visit  
4 flowers of a single floral type (hence one or a few plant species) within a foraging bout. It can  
5 be measured by the number of transitions among floral types visited within a bout (Waser,  
6 1986; Chittka *et al.*, 1999). Constancy is widespread across pollinator species and is  
7 explained, at least partially, by the limited short-term memory of pollinators for visual and  
8 olfactory cues and by their limited motor learning for handling flowers (Chittka *et al.*, 1999).

9 **Floral display** is the total number of flowers that are open simultaneously on a plant on a  
10 given day. Note that floral display sometimes also includes floral size (e.g. Goodwillie *et al.*,  
11 2010), despite an existing trade-off between number and size of flowers (Sargent *et al.*, 2007).

12 A **foraging bout** is the time a pollinator spends visiting flowers during a single sequence,  
13 between the moment it leaves its nest and the moment it returns to it.

14 **Inbreeding depression** is the relative decrease in fitness of selfed vs. outcrossed progeny,  
15 caused mostly by a combination of highly deleterious, nearly recessive alleles and mildly  
16 deleterious, nearly additive alleles. Recessive deleterious mutations are more likely to be  
17 eliminated by natural selection (purging) in inbred homozygotes, which creates a negative  
18 relationship between inbreeding depression and the population selfing rate (Lande &  
19 Schemske, 1985; see Box 2).

20 **Nestedness** characterizes networks with many specialist species and few extremely generalist  
21 species, as well as asymmetric specialization (specialist species tend to interact with  
22 generalist species).

23 **Pollen carryover** is the extent to which pollen collected on a flower is transported and  
24 deposited on stigmas of other flowers (of the same plant or different plants) during a foraging

1 bout; it depends on both the pollen uptake rate and pollen deposition rate (de Jong *et al.*,  
2 1993).

3 **Pollen discounting** is the reduction in outcrossed male siring success associated with an  
4 increase in selfing rate, due to decreased amounts of exported pollen (Nagylaki, 1976).

5 **Pollen limitation** is the reduction in plant reproductive success (fruit or seed set) due to  
6 inadequate quantity or quality in pollen receipt; it is usually tested for through supplementary  
7 pollination (see Knight *et al.*, 2005 for a review).

8 **Pollinator preference** is the propensity for an individual pollinator to visit a plant species  
9 disproportionately to the availability of resources this species provides (Cock, 1978); it is  
10 usually measured as number of visits per plant relative to other plant species.

11 **Self-pollination rate** is the fraction of self-pollen vs. conspecific outcross pollen deposited on  
12 plant stigmas.

13 **Selfing rate** is the rate of self-fertilization, the fraction of selfed vs. outcrossed embryos  
14 produced by an individual plant. It is defined at fertilization (primary selfing rate) but usually  
15 measured at a later stage (in seeds, seedlings or even adults, secondary selfing rate). Primary  
16 and secondary selfing rates can differ from the self-pollination rate due to (1) self-  
17 incompatibility, which can be partial or cryptic (e.g. via differences in growth rates of selfed  
18 vs. outcrossed pollen tubes) and (2) post-fertilization selection processes, for example  
19 selective flower abscission, fruit abortion or inbreeding depression.

20 **Selfing and outcrossing components** of self-compatible animal-pollinated plants with  
21 perfect flowers (following Lloyd, 1992). **Autonomous selfing** (a, dotted white lines; left  
22 panel of Fig. 2) corresponds to autogamous (within-flower) self-pollination occurring without  
23 pollinator visits; it is divided into three modes depending on the timing of outcross- vs. self-  
24 pollination: prior, competing (simultaneous), and delayed autonomous selfing. **Facilitated**  
25 **selfing** (f, dashed white lines; left panel of Fig. 2) corresponds to autogamous (within-flower)

1 self-pollination induced by pollinator visits. **Geitonogamous selfing** (g, solid white lines; left  
2 panel of Fig. 2) corresponds to self-pollination among flowers induced by pollinators probing  
3 several open flowers on the same plant. **Outcross pollination** (o, solid black lines) refers to  
4 pollen deposited on a flower that originates from other plants in the population. Estimates  
5 obtained from the method proposed in Box 1 are given with upper-case letters next to three  
6 flowers (right panel of Fig. 2).

7 **Selfing syndrome** is a characteristic set of morphological and functional plant traits that  
8 enhance pollen transfer efficiency within flowers and/or decrease pollinator visitation. Selfing  
9 syndrome usually includes small flowers, thus reduced anther-stigma distance (herkogamy),  
10 reduced petal size, and reduced corolla width (following Sicard & Lenhard, 2011).

11 **Specialization** has many definitions but is generally inversely related to the total number of  
12 species an individual, a population or a species interacts with. This number can be weighted  
13 by the frequency of interactions with each partner species.

**1 BOX 1: A METHOD FOR ESTIMATING FACILITATED SELFING**

2 Estimation of facilitated selfing is challenging because it requires devices to mark pollen or  
3 follow pollinator visits, while controlling for resource allocation, outcross pollen limitation  
4 and pollinator attraction. However, facilitated selfing could contribute significantly to  
5 observed selfing rates and their evolution. Indirect evidence of facilitated selfing is available,  
6 but only for plant species with specific floral types (Fig. 2 of the glossary): Johnson *et al.*  
7 (2005) make use of the absence of autonomous selfing in *Disa cooperi*, Vaughton *et al.*  
8 (2008) of the absence of geitonogamous selfing in *Bulbine vagans* and Owen *et al.* (2007) of  
9 the absence of both in *Bulbine bulbosa*; on the other hand, Anderson *et al.* (2003) use  
10 *Roridula* species for which facilitated selfing is performed by insects (hemipterans) that do  
11 not contribute to the other selfing components, performed by bees.

**12 *A simple, but adjustable, experiment to estimate all components of selfing***

13 Estimating the three components of selfing or self-pollination (Fig. 2 in the glossary) requires  
14 a detailed description of single-pollinator visits to individual plants. The method requires  $N$   
15 replicate caged plants with  $F$  individually-marked open perfect flowers. Identical numbers of  
16 flowers control for resource allocation if selfing (not self-pollination) rates are to be  
17 estimated. Each plant should be visited by a single pollinator carrying no pollen, which  
18 precludes outcross pollination and the visitation order of the pollinator should be recorded  
19 (some flowers can be visited several times, and some flowers may remain unvisited). The  
20 components of selfing and self-pollination can then be estimated by analysing the seed set of  
21 the  $N \times F$  flowers or by counting pollen grains deposited within each flower stigmas,  
22 respectively.

23 The simplest estimation method requires discarding all flowers visited more than once  
24 and counting pollen grains, not seeds, per flower to eliminate the delayed autonomous selfing  
25 component. Pollen loads provide information about (1) autonomous selfing for unvisited



1 flowers (2) autonomous and facilitated selfing jointly for flowers visited once as the first  
2 flower of the sequence, thus by a pollinator carrying no self-pollen, and (3) all three  
3 components of selfing for flowers visited once as the second flower of the sequence, by a  
4 pollinator carrying self-pollen from one previously visited flower (Fig. 2 of the glossary, right  
5 panel). More sophisticated methods could use seed sets from all  $F$  flowers but would need to  
6 control for delayed autonomous selfing (possibly via the number of visits per focal flower or  
7 per plant, depending on the underlying mechanisms) and for the quantity of geitonogamous  
8 self-pollen deposited on flowers as a function of their visitation rank. For practical reasons  $F$   
9 needs to be small enough to keep track of the entire pollinator visitation sequence and large  
10 enough such that pollinators do not visit all open flowers, but generate variation in the number  
11 of flowers visited per plant; some flowers may have to be removed and some pollinators may  
12 have to be excluded from the experimental cage to avoid too long visitation sequences.

1 **BOX 2: AN APPROXIMATION FOR EVOLUTIONARY EQUILIBRIA OF PLANT SELFING RATES:**  
2 **how to include the purging of inbreeding depression into ecological models of the**  
3 **evolution of selfing**

4 The evolutionary dynamics of inbreeding depression greatly influence plant mating system  
5 evolution and should not be overlooked. The joint evolution of inbreeding depression and  
6 selfing rates can be modeled using detailed genetic models of inbreeding depression, which  
7 has rarely been done in ecological theoretical studies (but see Porcher & Lande, 2005a; b;  
8 Porcher *et al.*, 2009) because it requires complex models and long computation time.  
9 Alternatively, an approximation assuming that plant selfing rates evolve by small mutational  
10 steps allows modeling the dynamics of purging without a full genetic model for inbreeding  
11 depression (Lande *et al.*, 1994; Johnston, 1998). This approximation amounts to letting the  
12 level of inbreeding depression vary with the selfing rate, and finding joint equilibria of the  
13 mating system and inbreeding depression, instead of assuming constant inbreeding depression  
14 (see Porcher & Lande, 2013 for more details). A numerical or analytical relationship between  
15 inbreeding depression and population selfing rate can be obtained from any genetic model  
16 (e.g. Kondrashov, 1985; Charlesworth *et al.*, 1990). Analytical relationships are derived from  
17 polynomial regressions (Johnston, 1998; Lepers *et al.*, unpublished manuscript) with  
18 relatively simple models of inbreeding depression (e.g. based on a single locus, Charlesworth  
19 *et al.*, 1990).

20 A change in the selfing rate modifies inbreeding depression, but also other components  
21 of plant fitness, via the automatic advantage of selfing (Fisher, 1941), reproductive assurance  
22 in pollen-limited environment, or pollen discounting. The approximation examines the  
23 indirect selection gradient on small changes in the selfing rate to find joint equilibria of the  
24 mating system and inbreeding, which occur at the intersection of the inbreeding depression  
25 function and a constraint function (Fig. 3). This constraint function summarizes all other

1 drivers of the evolution of the selfing rate, particularly ecological mechanisms, some of which  
2 are governed by pollinators and their behaviour (Porcher & Lande, 2005b; Devaux *et al.*,  
3 unpublished manuscript; Lepers *et al.*, unpublished manuscript). Singular strategies (selfing  
4 rates) correspond to fitness maxima or minima, which can be distinguished from the sign of  
5 the second partial derivative with respect to selfing rate at this strategy. Graphically, the  
6 singular strategy is evolutionarily stable (i.e. a maximum) if the constraint function is smaller  
7 (respectively larger) than inbreeding depression when the equilibrium selfing rate is increased  
8 (respectively decreased; Fig. 3).

9       The approximation ignores genotypic association among the loci controlling the selfing  
10 rates and those controlling inbreeding depression, and is therefore accurate only for moderate,  
11 but biologically realistic, genomic rates to deleterious mutations causing inbreeding  
12 depression ( $U < 0.2$ , Porcher & Lande, 2013). For larger mutation rates, differential purging  
13 occurs between genotypes with different selfing rates, a phenomenon that is not accounted for  
14 in the approximation, which thus becomes inaccurate. Large  $U$  may be found in perennial  
15 plants (see Porcher & Lande, 2013) and may better account for the observed similar levels of  
16 inbreeding depression in completely outcrossing and mixed-mating populations (Winn *et al.*,  
17 2011).

1 **FIGURE LEGENDS**

2 Figure 1. Summary of the constraints imposed by pollinator behaviour on the ecology and  
3 evolution of plant selfing rates. The upper panel describes the plant and pollinator traits that  
4 influence the deposition of each of the three origins of self pollen, as well as outcross pollen  
5 (see glossary). Traits with a positive (respectively negative) impact on amounts of pollen  
6 deposited are in black (respectively grey). The inner square recalls the definition of the rate of  
7 self-fertilization. The intermediate square groups plant and pollinator traits operating at the  
8 flower or individual plant levels. The outer square groups plant and pollinator characteristics  
9 operating at the population or network levels.

10

11 Figure 2. Clarification (left panel) and one estimation method (right panel, see also Box 1) of  
12 selfing components for self-compatible animal-pollinated plants with perfect flowers  
13 (following Lloyd, 1992).

14


15 Figure 3. Evolutionarily stable (closed circles) and unstable (open circles) selfing rates found  
16 at the intersection of the inbreeding depression curve (black line) and an ecological constraint  
17 function on plant fitness components (gray line).

18

19 Figure 4. Relationship between mating system and plant specialization in three plant-  
20 pollinator networks.

21 Box plots (with whiskers representing 1.5× interquartile) and mean (closed circles) of the  
22 number of pollinator species per plant (A-C) and number of pollinator species per visit (D-E).  
23 Mating systems were obtained from the Bioflor database and divided into three classes to  
24 obtain balanced and sufficient sample sizes: allogamous (“Allo.”, comprising ‘allogamous’  
25 and ‘facultative allogamous’ species of the database), mixed mating (“Mixed”), and

1 autogamous (“Auto.”, comprising both ‘facultative autogamous’ and ‘autogamous’ species of  
2 the database). *P*-values for the ‘mating system’ effects were obtained by analysing the  
3 variation in pollinator richness (either per plant or per visit), assuming it follows a  
4 quasipoisson distribution, as a function of the mating system alone (A-C) or the mating  
5 system, the number of visits and their interaction (D-E).  
6




1  
2  
3

Figure 1

1

2



3

4

5

6


Figure 2 (to be included in the glossary)

1

2

3

4



5


6

7

Figure 3 (to be included in Box 2)



1



2

3

4

Figure 4