

Research



Cite this article: Simpson DT, Weinman LR, Genung MA, Roswell M, MacLeod M, Winfree R. 2022 Many bee species, including rare species, are important for function of entire plant–pollinator networks. *Proc. R. Soc. B* **289**: 20212689.

<https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2021.2689>

Received: 12 December 2021

Accepted: 9 March 2022

Subject Category:

Ecology

Subject Areas:

ecology

Keywords:

biodiversity, ecosystem function, mutualism, bipartite networks, pollination, rare species

Author for correspondence:

Dylan T. Simpson

e-mail: dylan.simpson@rutgers.com

Electronic supplementary material is available online at <https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.c.5901174>.

Many bee species, including rare species, are important for function of entire plant–pollinator networks

Dylan T. Simpson¹, Lucia R. Weinman¹, Mark A. Genung^{2,3}, Michael Roswell^{1,4}, Molly MacLeod^{1,5} and Rachael Winfree²

¹Graduate Program in Ecology and Evolution, and ²Department of Ecology, Evolution and Natural Resources, Rutgers University, 14 College Farm Road, New Brunswick, NJ 08901, USA

³Department of Biology, University of Louisiana, Lafayette, LA 70503, USA

⁴Department of Entomology, University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742, USA

⁵Science Communications and Engagement, BioMarin Pharmaceutical Inc., Science Communications and Engagement, San Rafael, CA 94901, USA

DTS, 0000-0003-1515-868X; MR, 0000-0002-8479-9184

It is important to understand how biodiversity, including that of rare species, affects ecosystem function. Here, we consider this question with regard to pollination. Studies of pollination function have typically focused on pollination of single plant species, or average pollination across plants, and typically find that pollination depends on a few common species. Here, we used data from 11 plant–bee visitation networks in New Jersey, USA, to ask whether the number of functionally important bee species changes as we consider function separately for each plant species in increasingly diverse plant communities. Using rarefaction analysis, we found the number of important bee species increased with the number of plant species. Overall, 2.5 to 7.6 times more bee species were important at the community scale, relative to the average plant species in the same community. This effect did not asymptote in any of our datasets, suggesting that even greater bee biodiversity is needed in real-world systems. Lastly, on average across plant communities, 25% of bee species that were important at the community scale were also numerically rare within their network, making this study one of the strongest empirical demonstrations to date of the functional importance of rare species.

1. Introduction

Given the rapid loss of global biodiversity [1], it is imperative to understand how decreased biodiversity will affect functioning of natural systems [2]. In particular, ecologists need to understand the role of rare species in ecosystem function, given that rare species are at highest risk of extinction and are the primary focus of conservation [3].

Ecologists' understanding of biodiversity–ecosystem function (BEF) relationships has evolved as study systems have increasingly resembled natural ecosystems. In experiments, which often focus on single functions within one trophic level, greater biodiversity (specifically, species richness) increases ecosystem function, but function is often maximized at relatively low richness or is driven by high-functioning, dominant species [4–7]. Further work on BEF relationships, however, has highlighted nuance that comes from real-world complexity. In particular, BEF relationships can be mediated by spatio-temporal scale [8–10], the number of functions being considered (i.e. multi-functionality) [11–13], trophic interactions [14–17] and facilitation, including plant–soil feedbacks [18–21]. In these contexts, diversity effects often appear stronger than in simplified experiments (e.g. [8,11]), though this is not always the case [22–25].

An important consequence of studying BEF for a single function, place or time is that these narrow lenses can obscure the functional roles of rare species.

Often, common species appear to provide most of the function while rare species appear to contribute relatively little [23,26–29]. This is even true in natural systems; for example, regional-scale analyses show 1% of Amazonian tree species store 50% of the carbon [30], and 2% of bee species provide 80% of crop pollination [31]. However, these examples focus only on carbon storage while omitting myriad other ecosystem processes, or only on crop pollination, while omitting the pollination of diverse, wild plant communities.

Considering the many dimensions of natural systems has revealed some ways that rare species can be important to ecosystem functioning. For example, rare species can contribute disproportionately to functional trait diversity [32–34], which may facilitate multi-functionality [35,36] or maintain function across variable environments [37–39]. Additionally, rare species can contribute disproportionately to invasion resistance and food web stability [40–43]. All of these examples suggest that the (observed) importance of rare species can depend on which function(s) are measured and at which scale(s). Thus, it is important that BEF relationships be studied in their most relevant, real-world contexts.

Animal-mediated pollination is used by approximately 88% of plant species [44] and is one of the model systems for BEF research [2], but the study of plant communities in this context has been limited [45]. Most studies quantifying function within plant–pollinator networks have been simplified to either focus narrowly on the pollination of a single plant species (typically of a crop monoculture, e.g. [31,46,47]), or focus coarsely on average pollination across plant species (e.g. [48]). In nature, however, even in one time and place, pollination must be provided to many species simultaneously. Similarly, plant–pollinator interaction networks have been well-studied in ecological contexts (e.g. with respect to community stability or species interactions [49–52]), but network-level data have rarely been used in a BEF context. The relationship between network structure and ecosystem function has been explored theoretically [45,53], but empirical studies are rare (see [6,54]), especially in natural communities. Thus, despite the attention paid to plant–pollinator networks broadly, the simple question of how many pollinator species are needed to pollinate natural plant communities has yet to be addressed.

The number of pollinator species needed to pollinate a plant community will depend on the extent of differences among pollinator species in the plant species they visit (i.e. functional redundancy versus complementarity) (figure 1). On the one hand, most plant–pollinator networks exhibit some degree of nestedness, such that rare or specialist pollinators tend to interact with abundant, generalist plant species (and vice versa) [55,56]. The more nested a network is, the more redundant pollinator species will tend to be, because a few abundant generalists will dominate pollination across plant species (figure 1*b,d*). On the other hand, networks are not perfectly nested and some degree of functional complementarity among pollinators is also common [57]. The more complementary pollinator species are in their plant use, the greater need there will be for pollinator diversity at the scale of the entire network (figure 1*c,d*) [53].

Complementarity within plant–pollinator networks can also create a functional role for pollinator species that are rare within their network. Pollination of a single plant species, at least in one time and place, tends to be dominated by a few abundant pollinator species, while locally rare

species contribute relatively little [58,59] (but see [60]). The situation might be very different, however, when function is considered for each species in a plant community. For example, a pollinator species that is rare within the community could still be an important pollinator of a particular plant species if it is among the most frequent visitors to that plant (figure 1*c*). In this situation, locally rare pollinator species could still be important for pollination of the entire plant community, but this effect would be missed in studies in which function is measured for only a single plant species or is averaged across plant species.

Here, we use data from 11 plant–bee networks to ask how many pollinator species are needed to pollinate all of the plants in each network. To control for sampling effects and distinguish effects of stochasticity from those of complementarity among bee species, we used a randomization-based null model. Specifically, we ask (i) *what is the relationship between the number of plant species in a network and the number of bee species important for pollinating them?* And (ii) *how important are rare bee species to pollination?*

2. Methods

(a) Network data

We used 11 quantitative plant–bee network datasets collected by our laboratory in New Jersey, USA [61–63] (electronic supplementary material, text S1, figure S1 and table S1). Each dataset quantifies bee visitation to each species of a plant community, as observed in a single site in a single year. We chose datasets collected in one site and year so that differences in plant use by bees could not be driven by spatial or annual turnover in the bee community. Ten of these datasets were collected in natural or semi-natural meadows, while one was a planted field experiment in which each plant species was maintained at equal abundance.

Most of these networks include plant species on which few individual bees were observed. To limit our analyses to plant species for which we could be relatively confident of the visiting bee community, we excluded plant species with fewer than 20 observed plant–bee interactions (electronic supplementary material, tables S1–S3). This meant excluding a mean of 54% of plant species (range = 0–83% across networks), but only 8% of bee species (range = 0–33%) and 9.5% of individual plant–bee interactions (range = 0–27%). For the 11 datasets as analysed, plant species richness varied from six to 23, bee species richness varied from 22 to 86 and total individual plant–bee interactions varied from 227 to 4513. In total, the analysed datasets included 70 plant species and 173 bee species, with 20 943 total observed interactions, and 1479 unique species–species pairs across networks.

(b) Analysis

To start, we identified the most functionally important bee species for each plant species within each network. We used interaction frequency (i.e. the number of individual bees of a species that were collected from a given plant species) as a proxy for function, and defined ‘functionally important’ bee species as those that contributed a threshold per cent of visits to at least one plant species in their network [31]. We focus on results based on using a 5% threshold (as used by Kleijn *et al.* [31]) but, to test the sensitivity of our results to our choice in threshold, we repeat the analyses across thresholds from 2.5 to 10% (see electronic supplementary material, texts S2 and S3 and figures S2 and S3 for further discussion). Although visitation




Figure 1. Hypothetical pollinator abundance distributions illustrating how complementarity among pollinator species should affect the number of functionally important species. (a) The abundance of pollinators visiting the entire plant community. The two most abundant pollinators contribute 80% of floral visits. (b) In a community with low complementarity, the same generalist pollinator species dominate function for every plant species. (c) In a plant community with high complementarity, different pollinator species dominate visits to different plant species. (d) If pollinator species are perfectly redundant (as in (b)), the number of important pollinator species would not change with the number of plant species. If pollinator species are perfectly complementary (similar to (c)), there would be a positive linear relationship between the number of plants and important pollinators. The real world is likely in between, leading to a positive but saturating relationship. (Online version in colour.)

frequency can be an incomplete proxy for pollination function, we believe it is adequate in this case. Technically, a pollinator's contribution to function also depends also on its effectiveness (per-visit pollen deposition) and efficiency (essentially the 'quality' of pollination), and there are examples of frequent insect visitors being poor pollinators [64,65]. However, plants' most frequent floral visitors are typically their most important pollinators, and this relationship is especially pronounced for bees, which are the focus of this study [31,64,66]. Also, on a practical level, it would not have been possible to measure per-visit function for the 1479 unique plant–pollinator interactions in our datasets. Lastly, although plants and bees are mutually dependent, we chose to focus on the role of bee diversity in providing pollination, rather than the role of plant diversity in supporting bees. This was in part to expand on existing BEF literature [2], and also because it is more appropriate given

our data, which represent the bees that visit a given plant community.

(i) What is the relationship between the number of plant species in a network and the number of bee species important for pollinating them?

Within networks, we performed rarefaction to relate the number of important bee species to plant species richness. More specifically, we subset the observations in each network to generate plant communities of varying richness and counted the number of bee species important to at least one plant species in that set. Thus, just as site-based rarefaction measures the accumulation of new species with additional sites, we measured the accumulation of important bee species with additional plant

species. We included every possible level of richness for the network (i.e. from 1 to n species) and up to 1000 unique (and random) combinations of plant species per richness level. In instances in which there were less than 1000 combinations of plant species, we included all possible combinations. We then took the mean number of important bees across combinations of plant identity for each level of plant richness.

We represent results from this analysis as accumulation curves in which the mean number of bee species important to at least one plant species is plotted against the number of plant species in the community (*sensu* [8,9,67,68]; figure 1*d*). Greater complementarity among bee species should result in lower values for single plant species (indicating higher specialization by bees at the plant species level) and/or steeper slopes (indicating greater turnover of important bee species among plants).

The slopes observed in these curves will also be due, at least in part, to stochasticity. That is, even if there were no biological differences among bee species in terms of the plants they visit, they will visit plant species at different frequencies due to chance (i.e. sampling error) [51]. Similarly, we will observe differences in visitation rates due to human sampling error. As a result, any observed complementarity effect should be a combination of biology and stochasticity. To account for these stochastic effects, we created a randomization-based null model to define an expectation under a scenario of no biological complementarity. This null model assumes that there are no underlying differences among bee species, but rather that individual bees forage randomly across all the plant species in their network.

To generate the null expectation, we maintained the total number of observations of each plant species, but assigned interactions by random draw (with replacement) from the network-wide bee species abundance distribution. Said another way, the model maintained the empirical number of bee visits to each plant species (row sums of the plant–bee matrix), but resampled individual bee interactions with probabilities proportional to each bee species' relative abundance (column sums). We generated 999 null datasets per network [69] and then, for each of these datasets, we estimated the mean number of important bee species for each level of plant species richness.

In the Results, we report three metrics for each network. First, we calculate the change in the number of important bee species recorded for the average single plant species versus for the entire network (i.e. all plant species). This metric shows how the need for bee diversity increases with the number of plant species considered, when both the stochastic and the biological components of that increase are included. Second, we compare the observed number of important bee species to the inner 95th percentile of what was predicted by the null model. Observed values beyond the inner 95th percentile were considered significantly different than what would be expected under random foraging, suggesting that biological effects increase the functional complementarity among bee species and contribute to the need for biodiversity. Third, we calculate a standardized effect size (a Z -score) for each network that represents the magnitude of any non-stochastic (i.e. biological) effects on the number of important bee species in that network. Z -scores were calculated as the difference between the observed value and the null prediction, divided by the standard deviation of the null (i.e. $(\text{observed} - \text{null})/\text{s.d.}_{\text{null}}$), where all three values are calculated at maximum plant species richness (i.e. using all the plant species in the network). Thus, the Z -scores measure the strength of biological effects, such as niche partitioning and bee specialization, in driving the need for bee diversity, and express this effect in units of standard deviations of the null distribution.

Lastly, because our 11 networks varied in the number of plant species they contained, we also examined the role of plant species richness across (rather than within) networks. Specifically, we looked at Pearson's correlation between the

number of plant species in a network and each of the measures above, as well as simply the total number of bee species that were important to at least one plant species in that network.

(c) How important are rare bee species to pollination?

Here, we measured how many important bee species (i.e. functionally important to at least one plant species) in each network were also rare within that network. While rarity can be defined in many ways (e.g. [70,71]), we focus simply on local rarity—i.e. species with low relative abundance—which is how rarity has been typically considered in the BEF literature (e.g. [36,42]). This means we do not treat rarity as an intrinsic trait of a species; by our definition, a species could be rare in one community and common in another. In the main text, we focus on an analysis in which rarity was defined as any bee species representing less than 1% of all bee observations in its network (*sensu* [72,73]). However, because any definition of rarity is arbitrary, we also repeat the analysis across rarity thresholds of 0.5% to 1.5%. Finally, because rare species may occasionally appear important just due to sampling effects, we use our null model to compare our observed results to the null expectation under random foraging.

All our analyses were performed in R (v. 3.6.3), using packages *parallel* (3.6.3) and *pbapply* (1.4-0). Data management was done with *tidyverse* (1.3.1) and *lubridate* (1.7.10). All data and stand-alone code needed to re-create our analysis are available in the electronic supplementary material.

3. Results

(a) What is the relationship between the number of plant species in a network and the number of bee species important for pollinating them?

Within networks, the number of functionally important bee species increased rapidly with plant species richness (figure 2; electronic supplementary material, figure S4). Comparing the average single plant species with their respective communities (i.e. comparing the starting and ending points of the accumulation curves), the number of important bee species increased 2.5- to 7.6-fold (figure 2*a*). The accumulation curves of functionally important species were mostly non-saturating and rose beyond the inner 95th percentile of the null in all but two of the smallest networks (figure 2*a,b*; electronic supplementary material, figure S5). Z -scores, which measure the effect of complementarity on the number of important bee species relative to the expectation under random foraging, ranged from 1.1 to 12.2 (figure 2*c*).

Across networks, these results were each associated with plant species richness (figure 2). There was a strong correlation between the total number of plant species in a network and (i) the observed number of important bee species in that network ($r=0.92$, $p<0.001$), (ii) the factor increases in the number of important bee species, relative to a single plant species ($r=0.95$, $p<0.001$) and (iii) the Z -score ($r=0.95$, $p<0.001$). These results were also robust to our choice of threshold for defining functional importance. While the absolute number of important bee species decreased under a higher, less inclusive threshold, the factor differences between single plant species and their respective communities, and the associated Z -scores (i.e. the relative effect sizes), actually increased under higher




Figure 2. The number of important pollinator species increases with the number of plant species. (a) Accumulation curves for each of the 11 networks. Points represent the number of pollinator species important to at least one plant species in the full community, and lines represent the accumulation of important pollinator species across levels of plant species richness (i.e. means of rarefied plant communities) where the left end represents the average single plant species, and the right end represents the full plant community. (b) An example of one network's accumulation curve, now shown together with its null model and 95% CIs. The null model curve represents the expectation if individual pollinators forage randomly across the available plant species, while the observed curve includes biological effects, such as species-specific preferences, morphology or phenology that led to non-random foraging. (c) Z-scores for each network, representing the strength of the biological effects (complementarity) on the number of pollinator species found to be functionally important in a network, relative to the expectation under random foraging. Z-scores were calculated as the difference between observed and null expectation (red bar in (b)) divided by the standard deviation of the null (blue bar in (b)) at maximum plant richness for each network (i.e. at the endpoints of the curves in (a) and (b)). In (a) and (c), the blue line and points represent the experimental garden. (Online version in colour.)

thresholds (electronic supplementary material, text S3 and figures S5 and S6).

(b) How important are rare bee species to pollination?

Of the bee species that are functionally important to at least one plant species in a given network, a mean of 25% (range =




Figure 3. Many rare species are functionally important as pollinators. (a) Pollinator rank abundance distribution for a single network, with pollinator species that were important to at least one plant species highlighted in red. The dotted line represents 1% of total pollinator abundance in the network, which is our definition of rarity. In this community, 13 of 25 important pollinator species are rare. Similar plots for the rest of our communities can be found in the electronic supplementary material, figure S7. (b) The proportion of important species that were rare correlated with the number of plant species included in the analysis ($r = 0.95$, $p < 0.001$). When datasets were large enough to include more plant species, more rare pollinator species were found to be important. This increase was only weakly reflected in the null model. The network shown in (b) is circled in red. (Online version in colour.)

0–52%) were rare within that network (figure 3; electronic supplementary material, figures S7 and S8). More rare bees were important in more plant-rich networks ($r = 0.97$, $p < 0.001$), and this number was significantly greater than the null expectation in all but the smallest networks. As would have to be the case, the proportion of important bee species that are rare decreases with more conservative thresholds (higher thresholds for importance, and lower thresholds for rarity) (electronic supplementary material, figures S9 and S10). Even with the most conservative combination of thresholds, though, a mean of 7.8% and as many as 25% of the important bee species were rare within their network.

4. Discussion

By focusing on the pollination of individual plant species rather than plant communities, ecologists have likely underestimated the importance of pollinator diversity to pollination function in nature. Here, we show that the number of functionally important bee species increases rapidly as we expand from considering one to many plant species (figure 2). Up to seven-times more bee species made important contributions at the community scale, as compared with any

single plant species. The number of important bee species increased with the number of plant species in a community and did not asymptote in any of our datasets (figure 2), suggesting that even more bees are important in nature. This increased role of biodiversity results from complementary floral use among bee species. Complementarity in resource use among species is a well-known mechanism through which biodiversity increases ecosystem function in experiments [74], yet the primary way species partition resources within a mutualist network—partitioning the partners with which they interact—is invisible when function is measured for only a single partner species or averaged across species. Thus, it has largely been overlooked up to now.

Perhaps our most striking finding is that, when the whole-plant community was considered, rare bee species were frequently important to function. Regardless of the exact thresholds we used to define importance and rarity, a substantial portion of the functionally important bee species in our analyses were also rare within their community (means of 8–45%, across thresholds; figure 3; electronic supplementary material, figure S10). This result extends previous work that has suggested rare species could be important, but measured their functional role less directly. For example, rare species have been valued because they contribute to functional trait diversity [32,33,75] and because they could become abundant, and thus functionally important, at other places or times (i.e. insurance effects) [10,37,38]. By contrast, we demonstrated a direct and immediate contribution of locally rare species. This contribution did not depend on rare species making disproportionately large contributions to function (i.e. keystone effects [76,77]), which is another commonly cited way for rare species to be important. Instead, we found rare bees to be important because they filled distinct functional roles [35,77], in this case pollinating different plant species. Mechanistically, our approach of considering the pollination of many plant species is akin to measuring multiple ecosystem functions (i.e. ‘multi-functionality’), where it has likewise been found that locally rare species can provide functions not provided by other, more common species [35]. Both types of findings suggest that many more species are important to ecosystem function in complex natural communities, where the number of plant species and ecosystem functions greatly exceed what can be measured by researchers.

Floral specialization by pollinators is a well-described phenomenon [57,78], and so it may seem obvious that more plant species would require more pollinator species. Findings from network ecology, however, might predict the opposite. In particular, because plant–pollinator networks are typically nested [55,56], one might expect that abundant generalist pollinators would be responsible for most of the pollination across plant species, with rare or specialist species being largely redundant (figure 1*b,d*). Indeed, abundant bees in our study did provide more flower visits than rare bees (by definition), and so did have higher average contributions and were important to more plant species (electronic supplementary material, figure S8). Yet, if we were to only consider bee species’ average contributions across plant species, we would be ignoring the needs of those plant species that were visited primarily by less abundant bees (electronic supplementary material, figure S8). Our contribution in this paper is to

consider the pollinators needed by the whole-plant community, rather than just single plant species or the average plant species, and thereby to reveal the important role played by bee species that are rare at the community scale. Of course, this assumes the function of pollination is simply to support the plant community, and that plant species are equally important. If the greater function of interest is, for example, plant biomass, then these interactions between rarer plant and bee species may be of less consequence.

The extent to which our results extend to mutualist systems other than pollination networks likely depends on the extent of complementarity in those systems. Pollination networks tend to be relatively specialized (i.e. high complementarity). Other systems with similarly high levels of specialization (e.g. ant–myrmecophyte networks) might behave similarly, while the importance of partner species diversity may be lower in systems with relatively low specialization (e.g. seed-dispersal networks) [57]. There is also already evidence that interaction complementarity in plant–mycorrhizal networks lends an effect of fungal diversity on plant growth [20]. Thus, our study is neither the first nor final word, but is further evidence that we should consider BEF relationships in the context of real-world interaction networks.

Because our study was observational, we cannot know what would happen if particular bee species were lost from our networks. In particular, we do not know the pollen limitation status of the plants in our networks, which means we cannot predict how their reproduction would be impacted by some level of pollinator loss. Nor can we predict how the network might restructure after species loss. On the one hand, even a plant that is not currently pollen limited could become so following the loss of a dominant pollinator. On the other hand, pollinator species’ preferences are often dynamic [79,80], which should lend resilience to species loss [81]. That is, following the loss of a plant’s dominant pollinator species, other pollinators might shift or expand their diets, which could compensate for the loss [82]. However, increased pollinator generalization following the loss of a competitor can also decrease pollination quality due to increased interspecific pollen transfer [79,83,84]. Future research should work to determine which of these processes is dominant in determining pollination function (i.e. plant reproductive success) in the face of species loss. More broadly, understanding function within mutualistic networks will require understanding the extent to which interactions are fixed or plastic, and whether changes to network structure following species loss affect function for the remaining species.

Altogether, our results highlight the many dimensions of ecosystem function and the importance of considering real-world complexity for understanding BEF relationships in nature. In particular, mechanisms governing BEF relationships in nature may be invisible in small-scale or simplified study systems [16,85]. As a result, studying function at too small a scale or in too simple a system may lead us to underestimate the number of species needed for function in nature. For instance, despite positive biodiversity effects [46,74,86], function at local scales often relies on relatively few species because of dominance [4,7,23,29]. Yet, because of species turnover, far more species are needed to maintain function across broader spatio-temporal scales [8,10,37,87,88]. Similarly, more species are needed to maintain multiple

functions simultaneously than for any function alone because of functional complementarity [9,13,89,90]. Here, we demonstrate an analogous role of biodiversity in mutualist networks: even for a single function in a single place and time, many more species are needed to maintain function across a network than for any one partner species alone. Real-world ecosystems depend on many functions operating across broad spatio-temporal scales [85], and, like pollination, many of these functions are realized through mutualist interactions [91]. In the light of this, our results suggest that biodiversity may be even more important for real-world function than previously supposed.

Data accessibility. The analysis in this paper uses 11 plant–bee network datasets collected by our laboratory group. For convenience, these

data, along with code to reproduce our analysis and figures, are included here as electronic supplementary material [92]. Any use of these data, however, should cite the original papers.

Authors' contributions. D.T.S.: conceptualization, formal analysis, methodology, visualization, writing—original draft and writing—review and editing; L.R.W.: conceptualization and writing—review and editing; M.A.G.: conceptualization and writing—review and editing; M.R.: investigation and writing—review and editing; M.M.: investigation and writing—review and editing; R.W.: conceptualization, investigation, supervision, writing—original draft and writing—review and editing.

All authors gave final approval for publication and agreed to be held accountable for the work performed therein.

Competing interests. We declare we have no competing interests.

Funding. We received no funding for this study.

Acknowledgements. We kindly thank Charlie Nicholson for discussion and review of an earlier version of this manuscript.

References

- Rockström J *et al.* 2009 A safe operating environment for humanity. *Nature* **461**, 472–475. (doi:10.1038/461472a)
- Cardinale BJ *et al.* 2012 Biodiversity loss and its impact on humanity. *Nature* **486**, 59–67. (doi:10.1038/nature11148)
- Gaston K. 1994 *Rarity*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.
- Cardinale BJ, Srivastava DS, Duffy JE, Wright JP, Downing AL, Sankaran M, Jouseau C. 2006 Effects of biodiversity on the functioning of trophic groups and ecosystems. *Nature* **443**, 989–992. (doi:10.1038/nature05202)
- Jonsson M, Malmqvist B. 2003 Mechanisms behind positive diversity effects on ecosystem functioning: testing the facilitation and interference hypotheses. *Oecologia* **134**, 554–559. (doi:10.1007/s00442-002-1148-5)
- Fründ J, Dormann CF, Holzschuh A, Tscharntke T. 2013 Bee diversity effects on pollination depend on functional complementarity and niche shifts. *Ecology* **94**, 2042–2054. (doi:10.1890/12-1620.1)
- Smith MD, Knapp AK. 2003 Dominant species maintain ecosystem function with non-random species loss. *Ecol. Lett.* **6**, 509–517. (doi:10.1046/j.1461-0248.2003.00454.x)
- Winfree R, Reilly JR, Bartomeus I, Cariveau DP, Williams NM, Gibbs J. 2018 Species turnover promotes the importance of bee diversity for crop pollination at regional scales. *Science* **359**, 791–793. (doi:10.1126/science.aao2117)
- Isbell F *et al.* 2011 High plant diversity is needed to maintain ecosystem services. *Nature* **477**, 199–202. (doi:10.1038/nature10282)
- Allan E, Weisser W, Weigelt A, Roscher C, Fischer M, Hillebrand H. 2011 More diverse plant communities have higher functioning over time due to turnover in complementary dominant species. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **108**, 17 034–17 039. (doi:10.1073/pnas.1104015108)
- Zavaleta ES, Pasari JR, Hulvey KB, Tilman GD. 2010 Sustaining multiple ecosystem functions in grassland communities requires higher biodiversity. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **107**, 1443–1446. (doi:10.1073/pnas.0906829107)
- Gamfeldt L, Hillebrand H, Jonsson PR. 2008 Multiple functions increase the importance of biodiversity for overall ecosystem functioning. *Ecology* **89**, 1223–1231. (doi:10.1890/06-2091.1)
- Fanin N, Gundale MJ, Farrell M, Ciobanu M, Baldock JA, Nilsson MC, Kardol P, Wardle DA. 2018 Consistent effects of biodiversity loss on multifunctionality across contrasting ecosystems. *Nat. Ecol. Evol.* **2**, 269–278. (doi:10.1038/s41559-017-0415-0)
- Peralta G, Frost CM, Rand TA, Didham RK, Tylianakis JM. 2014 Complementarity and redundancy of interactions enhance attack rates and spatial stability in host–parasitoid food webs. *Ecology* **95**, 1888–1896. (doi:10.1890/13-1569.1)
- Poisot T, Mouquet N, Gravel D. 2013 Trophic complementarity drives the biodiversity–ecosystem functioning relationship in food webs. *Ecol. Lett.* **16**, 853–861. (doi:10.1111/ele.12118)
- Eisenhauer N *et al.* 2019 A multitrophic perspective on biodiversity–ecosystem functioning research. *Adv. Ecol. Res.* **61**, 1–54. (doi:10.1016/bs.aecr.2019.06.001)
- Hines J *et al.* 2015 *Towards an integration of biodiversity–ecosystem functioning and food web theory to evaluate relationships between multiple ecosystem services*, 1st edn. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: Elsevier Ltd.
- Wright AJ, Wardle DA, Callaway R, Gaxiola A. 2017 The overlooked role of facilitation in biodiversity experiments. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* **32**, 383–390. (doi:10.1016/j.tree.2017.02.011)
- Van Der Heijden MGA. 2010 Mycorrhizal fungi reduce nutrient loss from model grassland ecosystems. *Ecology* **91**, 1163–1171. (doi:10.1890/09-0336.1)
- Van Der Heijden MGA, Klironomos JN, Ursic M, Moutoglou P, Streitwolf-Engel R, Boller T, Wiemken A, Sanders IR. 1998 Mycorrhizal fungal diversity determines plant biodiversity, ecosystem variability and productivity. *Nature* **396**, 69–72. (doi:10.1038/23932)
- Eisenhauer N, Reich PB, Scheu S. 2012 Increasing plant diversity effects on productivity with time due to delayed soil biota effects on plants. *Basic Appl. Ecol.* **13**, 571–578. (doi:10.1016/j.baae.2012.09.002)
- Chisholm RA *et al.* 2013 Scale-dependent relationships between tree species richness and ecosystem function in forests. *J. Ecol.* **101**, 1214–1224. (doi:10.1111/1365-2745.12132)
- Winfree R, Fox JW, Williams NM, Reilly JR, Cariveau DP. 2015 Abundance of common species, not species richness, drives delivery of a real-world ecosystem service. *Ecol. Lett.* **18**, 626–635. (doi:10.1111/ele.12424)
- Gamfeldt L, Roger F. 2017 Revisiting the biodiversity–ecosystem multifunctionality relationship. *Nat. Ecol. Evol.* **1**, 1–7. (doi:10.1038/s41559-017-0168)
- van der Plas F. 2019 Biodiversity and ecosystem functioning in naturally assembled communities. *Biol. Rev.* **94**, 1220–1245. (doi:10.1111/brv.12499)
- Maas B, Tscharntke T, Saleh S, Dwi Putra D, Clough Y. 2015 Avian species identity drives predation success in tropical cacao agroforestry. *J. Appl. Ecol.* **52**, 735–743. (doi:10.1111/1365-2664.12409)
- Lohbeck M, Bongers F, Martínez-Ramos M, Poorter L. 2016 The importance of biodiversity and dominance for multiple ecosystem functions in a human-modified tropical landscape. *Ecology* **97**, 2772–2779. (doi:10.1002/ecy.1499)
- Gaston KJ. 2011 Common ecology. *Bioscience* **61**, 354–362. (doi:10.1525/bio.2011.61.5.4)
- Gaston KJ, Cox DTC, Canavelli SB, García D, Hughes B, Maas B, Martínez D, Ogada D, Inger R. 2018 Population abundance and ecosystem service provision: the case of birds. *Bioscience* **68**, 264–272. (doi:10.1093/biosci/biy005)
- Fauset S *et al.* 2015 Hyperdominance in Amazonian forest carbon cycling. *Nat. Commun.* **6**, 1–9. (doi:10.1038/ncomms7857)

31. Kleijn D *et al.* 2015 Delivery of crop pollination services is an insufficient argument for wild pollinator conservation. *Nat. Commun.* **6**, 7414. (doi:10.1038/ncomms8414)
32. Mouillot D *et al.* 2013 Rare species support vulnerable functions in high-diversity ecosystems. *PLoS Biol.* **11**, e1001569. (doi:10.1371/journal.pbio.1001569)
33. Jain M *et al.* 2014 The importance of rare species: a trait-based assessment of rare species contributions to functional diversity and possible ecosystem function in tall-grass prairies. *Ecol. Evol.* **4**, 104–112. (doi:10.1002/ece3.915)
34. Violle C, Thuiller W, Mouquet N, Munoz F, Kraft NJB, Cadotte MW, Livingstone SW, Mouillot D. 2017 Functional rarity: the ecology of outliers. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* **32**, 356–367. (doi:10.1016/j.tree.2017.02.002)
35. Jousset A *et al.* 2017 Where less may be more: how the rare biosphere pulls ecosystems strings. *ISME J.* **11**, 853–862. (doi:10.1038/ismej.2016.174)
36. Soliveres S *et al.* 2016 Locally rare species influence grassland ecosystem multifunctionality. *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. B* **371**, 20150269. (doi:10.1098/rstb.2015.0269)
37. Loreau M, Mouquet N, Gonzalez A. 2003 Biodiversity as spatial insurance in heterogeneous landscapes. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **100**, 12 765–12 770. (doi:10.1073/pnas.2235465100)
38. Reich PB, Tilman D, Isbell F, Mueller K, Hobbie SE, Flynn DFB, Eisenhauer N. 2012 Impacts of biodiversity loss escalate through time as redundancy fades. *Science* **336**, 589–592. (doi:10.1126/science.1217909)
39. Gerhard M, Schlenker A, Hillebrand H, Striebel M. 2021 Environmental stoichiometry mediates phytoplankton diversity effects on communities' resource use efficiency and biomass. *J. Ecol.* **110**, 430–442. (doi:10.1111/1365-2745.13811)
40. Zavaleta ES, Hulvey KB. 2004 Realistic species losses disproportionately reduce grassland resistance to biological invaders. *Science* **306**, 1175–1177. (doi:10.1126/science.1102643)
41. Lyons KG, Schwartz MW. 2001 Rare species loss alters ecosystem function–invasion resistance. *Ecol. Lett.* **4**, 358–365. (doi:10.1046/j.1461-0248.2001.00235.x)
42. Bracken MES, Low NHN. 2012 Realistic losses of rare species disproportionately impact higher trophic levels. *Ecol. Lett.* **15**, 461–467. (doi:10.1111/j.1461-0248.2012.01758.x)
43. Säterberg T, Jonsson T, Yearsley J, Berg S, Ebenman B. 2019 A potential role for rare species in ecosystem dynamics. *Sci. Rep.* **9**, 11107. (doi:10.1038/s41598-019-47541-6)
44. Ollerton J, Winfree R, Tarrant S. 2011 How many flowering plants are pollinated by animals? *Oikos* **120**, 321–326. (doi:10.1111/j.1600-0706.2010.18644.x)
45. Schleuning M, Fründ J, García D. 2015 Predicting ecosystem functions from biodiversity and mutualistic networks: an extension of trait-based concepts to plant–animal interactions. *Ecography* **38**, 380–392. (doi:10.1111/ecog.00983)
46. Hoehn P, Tschardtke T, Tylianakis JM, Steffan-Dewenter I. 2008 Functional group diversity of bee pollinators increases crop yield. *Proc. R. Soc. B* **275**, 2283–2291. (doi:10.1098/rspb.2008.0405)
47. Garibaldi LA *et al.* 2013 Wild pollinators enhance fruit set of crops regardless of honey bee abundance. *Science* **339**, 1608–1611. (doi:10.1126/science.1230200)
48. Kaiser-Bunbury CN, Muff S, Memmott J, Müller CB, Caffisch A. 2010 The robustness of pollination networks to the loss of species and interactions: a quantitative approach incorporating pollinator behaviour. *Ecol. Lett.* **13**, 442–452. (doi:10.1111/j.1461-0248.2009.01437.x)
49. Bascompte J, Jordano P, Olesen JM. 2006 Asymmetric coevolutionary networks facilitate biodiversity maintenance. *Science* **1**, 431–433. (doi:10.1126/science.1123412)
50. Bastolla U, Fortuna MA, Pascual-García A, Ferrera A, Luque B, Bascompte J. 2009 The architecture of mutualistic networks minimizes competition and increases biodiversity. *Nature* **458**, 1018–1020. (doi:10.1038/nature07950)
51. Vázquez DP, Blüthgen N, Cagnolo L, Chacoff NP. 2009 Uniting pattern and process in plant–animal mutualistic networks: a review. *Ann. Bot.* **103**, 1445–1457. (doi:10.1093/aob/mcp057)
52. Memmott J, Waser NM, Price MV. 2004 Tolerance of pollination networks to species extinctions. *Proc. R. Soc. B* **271**, 2605–2611. (doi:10.1098/rspb.2004.2909)
53. Blüthgen N, Klein AM. 2011 Functional complementarity and specialisation: the role of biodiversity in plant–pollinator interactions. *Basic Appl. Ecol.* **12**, 282–291. (doi:10.1016/j.baee.2010.11.001)
54. Kaiser-Bunbury CN, Mougil J, Whittington AE, Valentin T, Gabriel R, Olesen JM, Blüthgen N. 2017 Ecosystem restoration strengthens pollination network resilience and function. *Nature* **542**, 223–227. (doi:10.1038/nature21071)
55. Bascompte J, Jordano P, Melián CJ, Olesen JM. 2003 The nested assembly of plant–animal mutualistic networks. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **100**, 9383–9387. (doi:10.1073/pnas.1633576100)
56. Vázquez DP, Aizen MA. 2004 Asymmetric specialization: a pervasive feature of plant–pollinator interactions. *Ecology* **85**, 1251–1257. (doi:10.1890/03-3112)
57. Blüthgen N, Menzel F, Hovestadt T, Fiala B, Blüthgen N. 2007 Specialization, constraints, and conflicting interests in mutualistic networks. *Curr. Biol.* **17**, 341–346. (doi:10.1016/j.cub.2006.12.039)
58. Balvanera P, Kremen C, Miguel MR. 2005 Applying community structure analysis to ecosystem function: examples from pollination and carbon storage. *Ecol. Appl.* **15**, 360–375. (doi:10.1890/03-5192)
59. Kremen C, Williams NM, Thorp RW. 2002 Crop pollination from native bees at risk from agricultural intensification. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **99**, 16 812–16 816. (doi:10.1073/pnas.262413599)
60. Klein AM, Steffan-Dewenter I, Tschardtke T. 2003 Fruit set of highland coffee increases with the diversity of pollinating bees. *Proc. R. Soc. B* **270**, 955–961. (doi:10.1098/rspb.2002.2306)
61. Roswell M, Dushoff J, Winfree R. 2020 Data from: Male and female bees show large differences in floral preference. Dryad Digital Repository. (doi:10.5061/dryad.c3rr6q1)
62. MacLeod M, Genung MA, Ascher JS, Winfree R. 2016 Measuring partner choice in plant–pollinator networks: using null models to separate rewiring and fidelity from chance. *Ecology* **97**, 2925–2931. (doi:10.1002/ecy.1574)
63. Roswell M, Dushoff J, Winfree R. 2019 Male and female bees show large differences in floral preference. *PLoS ONE* **14**, e0214909. (doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0214909)
64. Ballantyne G, Baldock KCR, Rendell L, Willmer PG. 2017 Pollinator importance networks illustrate the crucial value of bees in a highly speciose plant community. *Sci. Rep.* **7**, 1–13. (doi:10.1038/s41598-017-08798-x)
65. Ne'Eman G, Jürgens A, Newstrom-Lloyd L, Potts SG, Dafni A. 2010 A framework for comparing pollinator performance: effectiveness and efficiency. *Biol. Rev.* **85**, 435–451. (doi:10.1111/j.1469-185X.2009.00108.x)
66. Vázquez DP, Morris WF, Jordano P. 2005 Interaction frequency as a surrogate for the total effect of animal mutualists on plants. *Ecol. Lett.* **8**, 1088–1094. (doi:10.1111/j.1461-0248.2005.00810.x)
67. Hector A, Bagchi R. 2007 Biodiversity and ecosystem multifunctionality. *Nature* **448**, 188–190. (doi:10.1038/nature05947)
68. Byrnes JEK *et al.* 2014 Investigating the relationship between biodiversity and ecosystem multifunctionality: challenges and solutions. *Methods Ecol. Evol.* **5**, 111–124. (doi:10.1111/2041-210X.12143)
69. North BV, Curtis D, Sham PC. 2003 A note on the calculation of empirical *p* values from Monte Carlo procedures. *Am. J. Hum. Genet.* **72**, 498–499. (doi:10.1086/346173)
70. Rabinowitz D. 1981 Seven forms of rarity. In *The biological aspects of rare plant conservation* (ed. H Syngé), pp. 205–217. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons Ltd.
71. Loiseau N *et al.* 2020 Global distribution and conservation status of ecologically rare mammal and bird species. *Nat. Commun.* **11**, 1–11. (doi:10.1038/s41467-020-18779-w)
72. Hercos AP, Sobansky M, Queiroz HL, Magurran AE. 2013 Local and regional rarity in a diverse tropical fish assemblage. *Proc. R. Soc. B* **280**, 20122076. (doi:10.1098/rspb.2012.2076)
73. Matias MG, Chapman MG, Underwood AJ, O'Connor NE. 2012 Increasing density of rare species of intertidal gastropods: tests of competitive ability compared with common species. *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.* **453**, 107–116. (doi:10.3354/meps09639)
74. Tilman D, Isbell F, Cowles JM. 2014 Biodiversity and ecosystem functioning. *Annu. Rev. Ecol. Syst.* **45**,

- 471–493. (doi:10.1146/annurev-ecolsys-120213-091917)
75. Leitão RP *et al.* 2016 Rare species contribute disproportionately to the functional structure of species assemblages. *Proc. R. Soc. B* **283**, 20160084. (doi:10.1098/rspb.2016.0084)
76. Lyons KG, Brigham CA, Traut BH, Schwartz MW. 2005 Rare species and ecosystem functioning. *Conserv. Biol.* **19**, 1019–1024. (doi:10.1111/j.1523-1739.2005.00106.x)
77. Dee LE, Cowles J, Isbell F, Pau S, Gaines SD, Reich PB. 2019 When do ecosystem services depend on rare species? *Trends Ecol. Evol.* **34**, 746–758. (doi:10.1016/j.tree.2019.03.010)
78. Cane JH, Sipes SS. 2006 Characterizing floral specialization by bees: analytical methods and a revised lexicon for oligolecty. In *Plant–pollinator interactions: from specialization to generalization* (eds NM Waser, J Ollerton), pp. 99–122. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
79. Brosi BJ, Briggs HM. 2013 Single pollinator species losses reduce floral fidelity and plant reproductive function. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **110**, 13 044–13 048. (doi:10.1073/pnas.1307438110)
80. CaraDonna PJ, Petry WK, Brennan RM, Cunningham JL, Bronstein JL, Waser NM, Sanders NJ. 2017 Interaction rewiring and the rapid turnover of plant–pollinator networks. *Ecol. Lett.* **20**, 385–394. (doi:10.1111/ele.12740)
81. Valdivinos FS, de Españés PM, Flores JD, Ramos-Jiliberto R. 2013 Adaptive foraging allows the maintenance of biodiversity of pollination networks. *Oikos* **122**, 907–917. (doi:10.1111/j.1600-0706.2012.20830.x)
82. Hallett AC, Mitchell RJ, Chamberlain ER, Karron JD. 2017 Pollination success following loss of a frequent pollinator: the role of compensatory visitation by other effective pollinators. *AoB Plants* **9**, plx020. (doi:10.1093/aobpla/plx020)
83. Morales CL, Traveset A. 2008 Interspecific pollen transfer: magnitude, prevalence and consequences for plant fitness. *CRC Crit. Rev. Plant Sci.* **27**, 221–238. (doi:10.1080/07352680802205631)
84. Magrach A, Molina FP, Bartomeus I. 2019 Niche complementarity among pollinators increases community-level plant reproductive success. *bioRxiv* 629931. (doi:10.1101/629931)
85. Gonzalez A *et al.* 2020 Scaling-up biodiversity–ecosystem function research. *Ecol. Lett.* **23**, 757–776. (doi:10.1111/ele.13456)
86. Garibaldi LA *et al.* 2015 Trait matching of flower visitors and crops predicts fruit set better than trait diversity. *J. Appl. Ecol.* **52**, 1436–1444. (doi:10.1111/1365-2664.12530)
87. Isbell F *et al.* 2017 Linking the influence and dependence of people on biodiversity across scales. *Nature* **546**, 65–72. (doi:10.1038/nature22899)
88. Isbell F, Cowles J, Dee LE, Loreau M, Reich PB, Gonzalez A, Hector A, Schmid B. 2018 Quantifying effects of biodiversity on ecosystem functioning across times and places. *Ecol. Lett.* **21**, 763–778. (doi:10.1111/ele.12928)
89. Lefcheck JS *et al.* 2015 Biodiversity enhances ecosystem multifunctionality across trophic levels and habitats. *Nat. Commun.* **6**, 1–7. (doi:10.1038/ncomms7936)
90. Schuldt A *et al.* 2018 Biodiversity across trophic levels drives multifunctionality in highly diverse forests. *Nat. Commun.* **9**, 1–10. (doi:10.1038/s41467-018-05421-z)
91. Bronstein JL. 2015 *Mutualism*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
92. Simpson DT, Weinman LR, Genung MA, Roswell M, MacLeod M, Winfree R. 2022 Many bee species, including rare species, are important for function of entire plant–pollinator networks. FigShare.