Biodiversity components mediate the response to forest loss and the effect on ecological processes of plant-frugivore assemblages

Rocío Peña¹, Matthias Schleuning², Isabel Donoso^{1,2}, Javier Rodríguez-Pérez^{1,3}, Fredrik Dalerum¹ & Daniel García¹

1. Depto. Biología de Organismos y Sistemas, Universidad de Oviedo, and Unidad Mixta de Investigación en Biodiversidad (CSIC-Uo-PA), E-33071 Oviedo, Spain

2. Senckenberg Biodiversity Climate Research Centre (SBiK-F), Senckenberganlage 25, 60325 Frankfurt (Main), Germany.

3. Department of Mathematics and its Applications, Université de Pau et des Pays de l'Adour, France.

ABSTRACT

1. Anthropogenic disturbances are jeopardizing ecosystem functioning globally. Yet we know very little about the effect of human impacts on ecological processes derived from trophic interactions. By focusing on biodiversity components of consumer and resource organisms, such as the diversity of phylogenetic lineages and the diversity of traits that influence species interactions, it is possible to simultaneously address the responses to disturbances and their effects on processes.
2. Here, we evaluate the consequences of forest loss on the ecological process of frugivory between fleshy-fruited plants and frugivorous birds. For two years, and at 14 sites representing a gradient of forest cover in the Cantabrian Range (N Iberian Peninsula), we monitored fruit and bird abundance, and fruit consumption. We compared the response to forest loss of both plants and birds by assessing changes in phylogenetic and trait-based functional diversity in relation to forest cover. We further evaluated how changes in these biodiversity components translate into functional changes by estimating the degree of functional complementarity of plant and bird species.
3. We found different responses of plants and birds to forest loss. The diversity of plant assemblages did not respond to changes in forest cover, whereas bird assemblages markedly lost phylogenetic and trait-based functional diversity at high levels of forest loss. Functional complementarity of birds was well predicted by phylogenetic and trait-based functional diversity, but functional complementarity of plants depended exclusively on the diversity of traits.
4. Forest loss filtered avian phylogenetic lineages and traits, and influenced how birds contributed to the frugivory process. These results show how the diversity decay of one trophic level may compromise ecological processes derived from trophic

interactions. Therefore, we suggest that a multitrophic response-effect framework, which includes measures of functional traits, lineages and species functional contributions across trophic levels, may be required to fully understand the ecological consequences of biodiversity decays.

Key-words: fleshy-fruited plants, frugivorous birds, interaction networks, matching traits, niche partitioning, phylogenetic diversity, trait-based functional diversity, trophic processes.

INTRODUCTION

Anthropogenic disturbances can affect ecosystem functioning through their impact on biodiversity, particularly since species extinctions can lead to decays in ecological functions (Cardinale et al., 2012; Dirzo et al., 2014). Although early studies have evidenced ecosystem functioning declines along negative gradients of species richness (e.g. Tilman & Downing, 1994; Valiente-Banuet et al., 2015), the mechanisms determining how biodiversity losses affect the resilience of ecological processes, especially those derived from trophic interactions, are still unclear (Reiss, Bridle, Montoya, & Woodward, 2009). In this sense, the functional impact of disturbances has been studied by focusing on species traits, that is, by identifying those traits that simultaneously determine species response to disturbance (response traits) and their functional contributions (effect traits, Lavorel & Garnier, 2002; see also Suding et al., 2008). In the case of trophic processes, i.e. those derived from interactions across trophic levels, functional decays are expected when processes depend on matching traits (i.e. traits determining interaction occurrence; Schleuning, Fründ, & García, 2015), and such traits also render species across trophic levels vulnerable to disturbance (Moretti et al., 2013; Schleuning et al., 2015). Nevertheless, trait-based approaches may be insufficient to comprehend the current and future vulnerabilities of trophic processes, and the explicit

consideration of species phylogenetic relationships has been called for (Díaz et al., 2013). Thus, it is necessary, first, to assess the response to disturbance of consumer and resource organisms in terms of both the phylogenetic and trait-based functional diversity, and second, to discern the effects of these two biodiversity components on trophic processes estimated from ecological interactions (Fig.1).

Phylogenetic diversity (i.e. the variety of lineages in a species assemblage; Cadotte, Dinnage, & Tilman, 2012) represents the evolutionary history of co-occurring species. Under the assumption that closely related species share similar characteristics in their phenotypic traits (Cadotte et al., 2012), it can be used as a proxy of the variability of ecological roles played by species within a community. Therefore, closely related species can be expected to share similar ecological interactions (Brousseau, Gravel, & Handa, 2017; Rezende, Lavabre, Guimarães Jr, Jordano, & Bascompte, 2007), and also similar sensitivity to disturbance (Helmus et al., 2010; Lososová et al., 2015). Trait-based functional diversity, on the other hand, directly describes the dispersion of phenotypic traits within species assemblages (Laliberté & Legendre, 2010; Villéger, Mason, & Mouillot, 2008). It is therefore an important indicator of potential filtering effects of anthropogenic disturbances, since such filtering will alter trait distributions (Bregman et al., 2016). Also, trait-based functional diversity could be considered as a determinant of ecosystem functioning, since it represents the functional contribution of the different species within communities (Gagic et al., 2015; Pigot et al., 2016).

Frugivory, the ecological interaction emerging from the consumption of fruits by animals, is a trophic process accounting for a substantial portion of energy flow in temperate and tropical ecosystems (Fleming, 1991; Jordano, 2000). Frugivory may drive plant population and community dynamics, through the demographic outcomes of seed predation and seed dispersal (Simmons et al., 2018), but it also affects the fitness of animals through

the varied nutritional or toxic values of fruits (Quintero, Pizo, & Jordano, 2020). Plant and frugivore assemblages are known to show variable levels of phylogenetic and trait-based functional diversity across environmental gradients (e.g. Dehling, Fritz, et al., 2014) or levels of disturbance (e.g. Bregman et al., 2016, Ribeiro et al., 2016). Land use, and specifically forest loss, represents one of the main drivers leading to altered frugivory interactions due to the decline in, or even the extinction of plant and frugivore populations (Farwig, Schabo, & Albrecht, 2017; McConkey et al., 2012). Plant-frugivore communities therefore represent suitable systems for evaluating the decay of an ecological process under anthropogenic disturbance.

Here we focus on the fleshy-fruited plants and frugivorous birds of the Cantabrian woodland to assess the consequences of forest loss on frugivory (Fig. 1). By using a gradient of forest cover, we first evaluate the responses of plants and frugivores through their phylogenetic and trait-based functional diversity. Second, we evaluate the effects of these biodiversity components in frugivory. For this, we used plant-frugivore interactions to measure how the species of each trophic level specialize on their interaction partners. We therefore regard this measure to represent species roles in terms of functional complementarity (Pigot et al., 2016) of both plants and birds. Our study represents a step beyond previous studies on frugivore biodiversity, which have evaluated responses to disturbance (e.g. Bregman et al., 2016) separately to effects on plant-frugivore interactions (e.g. Pigot et al., 2016). We also apply a multitrophic response-effect trait approach (Lavorel et al., 2013; Moretti et al., 2013), under which the same traits that influence the sensitivity of plants and frugivores to disturbance, may also influence the matching of species in plant-frugivore interactions. Specifically, we tested two hypotheses: 1) a loss of phylogenetic and trait-based functional diversity will occur along the forest loss gradient, and 2) the loss of

phylogenetic and trait-based functional diversity will lead to losses in complementarity of species contributions to frugivory.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Study system

This study was conducted in mid-elevation woodlands of the Cantabrian Range in the northern Iberian Peninsula. The main anthropogenic impact in this area is from deforestation, due to historical logging and the opening of rangeland for extensive livestock rearing, which has led to a highly-fragmented forest landscape (García, Quevedo, Obeso, & Abajo, 2005). The remnant woodlands contain variable-sized patches of primary and secondary forest, embedded in an extensive matrix of pastures with stony meadows and heathland. The secondary forest is typically dominated by fleshy-fruited trees (e.g. hawthorn *Crataegus monogyna*, holly *Ilex aquifolium*, rowan *Sorbus aucuparia*, etc) and shrubs (blackberry *Rubus fruticosus/ulmifolius*, wildrose *Rosa spp.*, etc.). Fruiting plant species have sequential ripening peaks (see Table S3.1 in Supporting Information). However, standing fruit crops of plant individuals can remain for several months, resulting in a wide overlap between species in their fruiting periods. The main frugivores in the study region are passerine birds, which can have mutualistic and antagonistic effects on plants (Simmons et al., 2018). Many species swallow entire fruits, enabling the deposition of intact seeds after regurgitation or defecation (legitimate seed dispersers; e.g. thrushes *Turdus spp.*, European robin *Erithacus rubecula*). Other species peel the fruits to feed on the seeds (seed-predators; e.g. bullfinch *Pyrrhula pyrrhula*) or pick out the pulp and discard the seeds (pulp-eaters; e.g. Great tit *Parus major*; Simmons et al., 2018). We focused here on frugivory as a trophic process, considering all frugivorous birds irrespective of their handling behavior and any potential differences in terms of their demographic effect on plants.

Sampling design

The study was conducted from 2012 to 2014 in two localities in Asturias: Sierra de Peñamayor (43°18'09.5"N 05°30'32.6"W) and Bandujo-Puertos de Marabio (43°14'35.2"N 6°05'41.6"W). In total, we delimited fourteen 150 x 150 m study plots with a minimum distance between plots within each locality of 350 m. The plots were chosen to represent similar vegetation composition, geomorphology (slope $\leq 25\%$, limestone substrate, altitude 990-1250 m asl) and anthropic management (extensive livestock), as well as to include a wide gradient of forest cover (3 to 70 %), interpreted here as a negative gradient of forest loss. Forest cover per plot was estimated as the proportion of area occupied by the canopy projection of all trees (DBH > 10 cm, height > 1.5 m), digitized in a Geographic Information System (GIS, ArcGIS9.3) based on 2011 1:5000 orthophotographs.

Plant and bird assemblages

At the beginning of the fruiting season (September to February) of 2012-2013 and 2013-2014, we recorded fleshy fruit production as an estimate of the pool of fruits available annually to frugivores. In each plot, we mapped all individual fruiting trees and shrubs (for blackberry, bramble patches > 50 cm diameter) and estimated individual crop sizes. We visually estimated the number of standing fruits (we considered the arilated seeds in yew *T. baccata* and blackberries as single fruits for counting) per individual tree or shrub, by means of a semi-quantitative scale with six intervals (0 = without fruits; 1 = 1–10 fruits; 2 = 11–100; 3 = 101–1000; 4 = 1001–10 000; 5 $\geq 10 001$; Fruiting Abundance Index (FAI), Saracco et al., 2004). Individual crop sizes were extrapolated from FAI ranks considering an allometric fit between the actual crop size and FAI (actual crop size = $1.765^{1.9249\text{FAI}}$; $R^2 = 0.80$; $N = 136$

individual plants; Martínez and García 2015). For each plot, we also estimated plant species richness as the number of fleshy-fruited plant species present.

In each plot, during the fruiting season, we conducted point-count bird censuses between 9.00 and 15.00, avoiding days of heavy rain and wind, from nine census points regularly distributed throughout a 36-cell grid (25 x 25 m cells; each point in the center of a set of four adjacent cells). Nine census rounds were performed per point-count, plot and annual fruiting season (1-2 censuses/month), with a total effort of 189 sampling hours. In each, all birds heard or seen (with the help of 8 x 30 binoculars) within a 5 min period were registered. Bird richness was estimated as the number of species detected across all censuses per plot.

We constructed plot-based matrices of species abundances (abundance-matrix hereafter) for plants and for birds to represent local species assemblages. For this, we estimated the absolute abundance of each species based on the cumulative number of records (fruits or birds) per plot, pooling the data for the two annual fruiting seasons. Species rarefaction curves (Fig. S7) indicate that our sampling effort was complete enough to detect maximum species richness in both plants and birds.

Plant-frugivore interactions and regional network

In each plot during the fruiting season (September-February), we recorded fruit consumption of birds by monitoring bird activity in independent observation slots of the point-count census, between 9.00h and 15.00h . Observation rounds were carried out by a single observer per plot, moving around 3-4 strategic positions within a plot (vantage points, different to point-count positions) during a 1h period in each plot. These vantage points were chosen to visually cover the whole plot extent (and hence to include different fruiting plant species), and were positioned at distances > 50 m from the individual fruiting plants. The observer

approached the vantage points, through a low detectability zone, in order to minimize bird reluctance to their presence. Four different observers were involved in the observation rounds, alternating between plots. In each round, recordings of every feeding bout (a single bird handling a single fruit) were made with 8 x 30 binoculars at distances ranging from 50 to 100 m. Over the study period, we performed 17 observation rounds of 1-hour-per-plot (i.e. 8 rounds in 2012-13 and 9 in 2013-2014) with a total effort of 238 sampling hours. We estimated the cumulative number of fruits of each plant species consumed by each bird species so as to build a regional-level interaction network (Table S4.). Although present in the study site, no frugivory event was recorded for honeysuckle *Lonicera periclymenum*, wildrose or blackthorn *Prunus spinosa*, and therefore these plant species were excluded from further analysis.

Biodiversity components

We aimed to estimate plot-scale measures of plant and bird biodiversity through different components. To do this, we considered the contributions of the different species present in each local assemblage of fleshy-fruited plants and frugivorous birds to the 1) the variety of phylogenetic lineages (phylogenetic diversity); and the 2) variability in traits which are relevant for frugivory (trait-based functional diversity). In order to estimate each component, we constructed distance-based matrices of phylogenetic relationships and traits for plants and birds separately. Moreover, in order to account for the importance of species abundances in explaining ecological functions (Gagic et al., 2015), both biodiversity components were weighted by the abundance of species in each local assemblage (square-root transformed abundances).

Phylogenetic diversity—We extracted the phylogenetic distances between the plant species studied here from the comprehensively dated phylogeny of the European flora “Daphne”

(Durka & Michalski, 2012). This phylogeny is based on the backbone family phylogeny of the Angiosperm Phylogeny group III (Bremer et al., 2009), but dated using more recent molecular studies. We extracted the plant tree using the *drop.tip* function of the APE package (Paradis & Schliep, 2018) in R. For birds, we built 10000 time-calibrated trees from the BirdTree online tool (BirdTree.org), using Ericson method as a backbone for phylogenetic reconstruction (Ericson et al., 2006; Jetz, Thomas, Joy, Hartmann, & Mooers, 2012). We used TreeAnnotator (Drummond & Rambaut, 2007) to generate the maximum clade credibility (Bayesian MCC) tree. We regard these approaches to provide the best information currently available for the phylogenetic relationships of the included plant and bird species, respectively.

To assess phylogenetic diversity, we measured the phylogenetic distances (branch length) for plant and for bird species in their respective phylogenetic trees (Fig. S2). Then, for each plot and trophic level, we estimated the phylogenetic dispersion among the species present in each local assemblage by means of the Mean Pairwise Distance (MPD). To this end, we extracted the square root of the pairwise phylogenetic distance matrix (Letten & Cornwell, 2015) for both phylogenies using the *cophenetic* function in the R package *ape* (Paradis & Schliep, 2018). Finally, we estimated the abundance-weighted MPD values of each plot using the *mpd* function in the R package *picante* (Kembel et al., 2010).

Trait-based functional diversity—To estimate the functional diversity of plant and frugivore assemblages, we focused on four phenotypic traits related to three levels of matching involved in frugivory: 1) traits related to fruit handling, such as bird bill length and bill width, assumed to match with fruit length and diameter (Dehling, Jordano, Schaefer, Böhning-Gaese, & Schleuning, 2016; Dehling, Töpfer, et al., 2014); 2) traits related to consumer energy requirements and resource availability, such as bird body mass (Jordano, 2014) and plant crop mass (Dehling, Töpfer, et al., 2014); 3) traits related to consumer

foraging behavior and resource spatial structure, such as bird Kipp's index (Kipp's distance divided by wing length; Dehling, Töpfer, et al., 2014), which indicates wing pointedness and is related to mobility and preferred forest stratum (pointed wings are typical of canopy foragers), and plant height (Dehling, Töpfer, et al., 2014). All plant traits were estimated from field sampling. Fruit measurements were based on 25 ripe fruits (five fruits from five different individuals) sampled in the study plots in 2012-2013. Crop mass was estimated by multiplying mean fruit mass by mean crop size for each plant species. Plant height was measured as the maximum height of each species in the study plots. For each bird species, we measured bill height and bill length, and Kipp's index in museum specimens (minimum 4 specimens per species, 2 male and 2 female), and obtained body mass from Dunning (2008). With the four matching traits of each trophic level, we constructed species x trait matrices using the means of each species trait, and where plant crop mass and bird body size were log-transformed.

We measured trait-based functional diversity in terms of trait-based distances among species, that is, the magnitude of the differences of a set of species to the average trait value in each (plant or bird) assemblage. For this, we first combined all matching traits to build plant and bird multidimensional trait spaces, based on Euclidean distances, using Principal Coordinates Analysis (PCoA; Villéger et al., 2008), in which all species (i.e. the whole set of species from every local assemblage) were projected. Then, we calculated values of Functional Dispersion (FDis) separately for plants and for birds for each plot. This index reflects the average distance of the species present locally to the centroid of the multidimensional trait-space of the species assemblage (Laliberté & Legendre, 2010; Villéger et al., 2008). Abundance-weighted FDis values and PCoA axes were estimated with the *dbFD* function in the R package FD (Laliberté, Legendre, & Shipley, 2014).

Species contributions to frugivory

We aimed to estimate the trophic process of frugivory based on the contributions of individual species to the plant-frugivore interaction network. We considered all interactions across plots to build a single, regional network in which species roles were estimated irrespective of the local conditions, avoiding potential biases determined by differences in network size among plots (Dormann, Fründ, & Schaefer, 2017). Thus, we built a regional network by pooling all observations of feeding bouts, corresponding to the different pairings of plant and bird species, across observation rounds, fruiting seasons and plots.

We estimated the contribution of each plant and bird species to the regional network from their degree of specialization on their respective interacting partners (Pigot et al., 2016), by means of standardized Kullback-Leibler divergence (d' ; Blüthgen et al., 2006). This is a measure of the specialization of a given species and also of the exclusiveness (non-overlap) in interactions relative to other species, representing thus the complementarity in the functional niche of species within the same trophic level (Blüthgen & Klein, 2011). Values of d' , which range from 0 to 1, were estimated from the regional network with the *bipartite* package in R (Dormann, 2011). Afterwards, we calculated local values of niche partitioning for plant and bird assemblages separately ($\langle d' \rangle$), as the abundance weighted mean d' values of the species present in each local assemblage (i.e. we used plot-based abundance matrices). High local values of $\langle d' \rangle$ thus characterize assemblages with a high degree of partitioning in their interaction niches, indicating a high degree of functional complementarity among species in the provision of frugivory.

DATA ANALYSIS

Standardization of metrics

To account for the potential effects of differences in species abundances across plots on the estimates of biodiversity components (MPD, FDis) and the degree of functional complementarity ($\langle d' \rangle$) of plants and birds, we calculated standardized effect sizes (ses) for all metrics using null models. For this purpose, we compared observed values of local assemblages (i.e. those estimated through weighting by abundance matrices) to 1000 sets of randomized assemblages generated using “*quasiswap count*” on the abundance matrices (Miklós & Podani, 2004; Oksanen et al., 2018). This permutation algorithm randomizes local abundance values by keeping both dimensions of the abundance matrix constant (marginal totals of species and plots). To calculate standardized effect sizes of MPD, FDis and $\langle d' \rangle$, we subtracted the random mean value from the observed local values, and divided this result by the standard deviation of the random values. For simplicity, henceforth all mentions of MPD, FDis and $\langle d' \rangle$ refer to the standardized form, which represents units of standard deviation rather than units from the raw values. All standardized effect sizes were tested for collinearity with species richness by means of pairwise Pearson’s correlation coefficient (Table S1).

Response to forest cover

First, we studied the effect of forest loss on two biodiversity components by checking the response of phylogenetic and trait-based functional diversity to forest cover. For this, we fitted a linear mixed-effect model (*lme4* package in R, Bates et al., 2015) for plants and birds separately. The model considered plot-level values of standardized MPD and FDis as a single response variable. Forest cover (log-transformed) and the type of biodiversity component (MPD, FDis) were included as explanatory fixed factors. An interaction between the fixed factors was also included in order to test whether the effect of forest cover differed between components. Plot identity was incorporated as a random factor.

Effects of biodiversity components on functional complementarity

Second, we studied the effects of the biodiversity components on the degree of functional complementarity in the trophic process (frugivory). We fitted linear mixed-effect models considering plot-level values of $\langle d' \rangle$ of both plants and birds as response variable, and MPD and FDis of plants and birds as predictors (separate models for MPD and FDis). In order to control for the differences between plants and birds, each model also incorporated the trophic level as a fixed factor (with two levels: plants and birds) and the interaction between trophic level and MPD or FDis, in order to test whether the relationship between biodiversity and functional complementarity differed between trophic levels. Plot identity was included as a random factor.

RESULTS

Overall, we detected 7 species of fleshy-fruited plants and 17 species of birds involved in plant-frugivore interactions. In each plot, the richness of fruiting plants ranged from 3 to 6 species, and was independent of forest cover (Fig. S1). Two plant species, holly and hawthorn, were dominant and occurred in all plots (mean relative abundance: 45.7% and 40.1%, respectively; Table S6.1). Richness of frugivorous birds per plot varied from 8 to 15 species, and was positively correlated with forest cover (Fig. S1). Blackbird was the most frequent and abundant bird species, followed by redwing *T. iliacus* and European robin (mean relative abundances: 32.2%, 16.0% and 13.4%, respectively; see Table S6.2). Frugivory observations rendered 3158 consumed fruits. We detected 56 pairs of plant-bird interactions, with hawthorn-blackbird and holly-blackbird being the most frequent (33.2 % and 14.8 % of fruits consumed, respectively). Plants belonged to four families (Fig. S2), with yew, the only gymnosperm, as the most distant species. Birds belonged to five passerine

families, Eurasian jay *Garrulus glandarius* being the phylogenetically most unique species (Fig. S2).

According to the multidimensional trait-spaces, plants showed lower trait variability than birds (Fig. S3). PCoA identified two dimensions that accounted for 92.9% of the total variance of trait values across plant species. The first plant PCoA dimension (81.1% of variance explained) was negatively correlated with all single traits (Fig. S3a). Bird PCoA also identified two main axes that accounted for 96.5% of variance. The first bird PCoA dimension (76.6%) represented a positive gradient of bill width, bill height, and body mass (Fig. S3b). The second bird PCoA dimension (19.9%) was positively correlated with Kipp's index.

Response to forest loss

For plants, MPD and FDis were not affected by forest cover (Fig 2a, Table 1). Conversely, both MPD and FDis of birds showed a significant decrease with declining forest cover (Fig. 2b, Table 1), but with a steeper slope in MPD ($\beta_{st} = 1.03$) than in FDis ($\beta_{st} = 0.51$). For both plants and birds, MPD was positively correlated to local species richness (Table S1). FDis, on the other hand, was positively correlated with local species richness for birds, but not for plants.

Effects of biodiversity components on functional complementarity

The local values of functional complementarity $\langle d' \rangle$ were, on average, higher for plants than for birds (Fig. 3; Table 2). Individual plant and bird species showed similar ranges of variation in their specialization on interaction partners ($d' = 0.06$ - 0.65 , Fig. S4).

The relationships between $\langle d' \rangle$ and the biodiversity components varied depending on the component and the trophic level (Table 2). MPD showed a positive effect on $\langle d' \rangle$, but

only in the case of birds (Fig. 3a; Table 2). However, FDis were positively related to $\langle d' \rangle$ for both plants and birds (Fig. 3b, Table 2).

DISCUSSION

Here, we focus on different biodiversity components to understand the response of species assemblages to anthropogenic disturbance, and the effect of these components on ecological processes derived from trophic interactions. Specifically, we account for phylogenetic lineages and interaction-related matching traits of fleshy-fruited plants and frugivorous birds. Our results suggest a decoupled response of plant and bird assemblages: while plants did not respond to forest loss, birds suffered a decrease in phylogenetic and trait-based functional diversity in response to forest loss. Moreover, functional complementarity of birds in plant-frugivore networks was closely associated with phylogenetic and trait-based functional diversity. In contrast, functional complementarity of plants depended on the diversity of plant matching traits, but not on phylogenetic diversity. Forest loss, therefore, filtered bird phylogenetic lineages and traits, leading to frugivore assemblages with reduced functional complementarity.

Response to forest loss

Our analysis across the regional gradient reveals that plant and bird assemblages differed in their response to forest cover. In our study system, forest cover did not affect plant diversity, contrasting with other studies where disturbance had a negative impact on plant trait-based functional diversity and led to an impoverishment in the variety of phylogenetic lineages (Laliberté et al., 2010; Ribeiro et al., 2016). Here, the studied forest cover gradient entailed a change in local total fruit abundance (Pearson's correlation coefficient: $r = 0.61$, $P = 0.02$; $N = 14$ plots), but did not affect plant richness (Fig. S1). In fact, most fruit resources were

provided by the almost ubiquitous hawthorn and holly (ranging from 73% to 99% of total fruit availability across plots), together with the frequent blackberry (Table S6.1). Because these plants are able to recolonize deforested land and form secondary successional patches (Martínez & García, 2017), the composition of the fleshy-fruited plant assemblages seems resilient in the face of loss of forest cover. Besides, other fleshy-fruited tree species, such as yew, could have escaped logging and cattle browsing, owing to low, but persistent recruitment at safe sites for establishment (García & Obeso, 2003).

Conversely to plants, birds suffered a loss of diversity with decreasing levels of forest cover (Fig. 2), as also shown by previous studies regarding the impact of land use (Bregman et al., 2016; Petchey, Evans, Fishburn, & Gaston, 2007). This decay was nonlinear, suggesting some robustness in bird assemblages from high to medium levels of forest availability, but a quickly accelerating loss of biodiversity at the threshold of low forest cover (ca. 20%). Such robustness was probably related to the persistence of a core of common species, like the small-sized great tit (Paridae) and European robin (Turdidae), together with the occurrence of medium-sized thrushes and blackbird (Turdidae). The occurrence of these species would maintain both high degrees of phylogenetic and trait-based functional diversity (Figs. S2-S3; Table S3). Our results suggest that the traits measured here are related to the ability of bird species to cope with forest loss; such traits could be defined as *response traits* to forest loss (Schleuning et al., 2015). For example, avian body and bill size, as well as a pointed wing shape, seem beneficial to the exploitation of the fruits of varied sizes spatially scattered across the landscape (Plein et al., 2013). Moreover, our results suggest that other traits not measured here, but related to phylogenetic differences among species, were also probably acting as response traits. For example, some lineages (e.g. Turdidae) have behavioral traits (e.g. flocking behavior, winter frugivorous diet) which are important in tracking and exploiting fruit resources across fragmented landscapes during winter (García,

Zamora, & Amico, 2011). Despite the ability of bird assemblages to cope with forest loss up to a certain extent, reductions below this threshold filtered frugivore assemblages, resulting in the loss of species that were of distant lineages and with morphologically distinct traits (e.g. European jay and blackcap *Sylvia atricapilla*; Figs. S2-S3). The high distinctness of these species may, in fact, represent higher levels of specialization in other niche requirements (as suggested by Coux et al., 2016), which are probably only fulfilled in areas of high forest cover (complementary dietary components, such as acorns for jay or insects for blackcap; e.g. Carnicer et al., 2009; Selås, 2017).

Effects of biodiversity components on functional complementarity

We found large differences across plots in frugivory, measured as functional complementarity of plant and bird species within plant-frugivore networks. We found substantial variation from high specialization (i.e. high niche segregation) to high generalization (i.e. high niche overlap) among species in both plants and birds (see also Pigot et al., 2016). For both trophic levels, these differences were related to changes in trait-based functional diversity, with greater trait dispersion encompassing higher functional complementarity in frugivory (see also Dehling et al., 2016). This pattern seems related primarily to the inclusion of small-sized fruits and their specialized frugivores in interaction networks (García, Donoso, & Rodríguez-Pérez, 2018). Namely, small-sized drupes, like elder *Sambucus nigra* and blackberry, are mostly eaten by small birds such as blackcap, but also by other, larger species, such as bullfinch and European jay, which increase the degree of trait-based functional diversity in local bird assemblages. Interestingly, tropical systems have shown the opposite pattern in that specialized interactions were mostly driven by large fruits (Naniwadekar, Chaplod, Datta, Rathore, & Sridhar, 2019).

The positive correlation shown here between trait-based functional diversity and functional complementarity in both birds and plants may be interpreted from two perspectives. Firstly, the diversity of matching traits influences the variety of possible interactions in a community. A high diversity of matching traits thus increases niche differentiation, and thereby functional complementarity, among species (e.g. complementarity in resource use, Gagic et al., 2015). This perspective highlights that trait matching is an important mechanism that conditions forbidden links and the occurrence of plant-bird interactions (e.g. birds of small gape size are not able to feed on large fruits; Dehling et al., 2016). Secondly, it suggests that the contribution of individual bird and plant species to the functional complementarity among species in interaction networks depends on specific functional traits. Here we pinpoint phenotypic traits such as bird body size and fruit size as important effect traits (sensu Suding et al., 2008), which implies that large bird species contribute more to frugivory (see also Schleuning et al., 2015). For birds, functional complementarity was also positively related to phylogenetic diversity. This correlation may partially result from the fact that the bird phenotypic matching traits measured here are known to show a significant phylogenetic signal (e.g. Rezende et al., 2007). Also, it suggests that functional complementarity among frugivorous birds may respond to some unmeasured traits represented by lineage differences, like foraging and spatial behavior (Schleuning et al., 2014). Conversely, for plants, the variety in phylogenetic distances was not a proxy of functional complementarity among species in interaction networks. In fact, phylogenetically unrelated species (e.g. rowan and yew) showed a similar low degree of specialization in interactions, whereas highly related species (e.g. rowan and whitebeam *Sorbus aria*) differed markedly (Fig. S4). Because we found that functional complementarity was related to matching traits of plants, our results suggest the existence of ecological convergence among

different lineages of fleshy-fruited plants sharing phenotypic traits such as fruit size and plant height and similar interaction partners (Rezende et al., 2007).

Our study was on a relatively species poor plant-frugivore system. We therefore argue that our findings may also be applied to other species-poor systems affected by similar processes of historical forest loss (e.g. Farwig et al., 2017; González-Varo, 2010). However, they could also be relevant for species-rich systems where fleshy-fruited plants may show resilience to antropogenic impact (e.g. Pires et al., 2014), but significant loss of frugivore diversity has been found in responses to forest loss (e.g. Morante-Filho, Arroyo-Rodríguez, Pessoa, Cazetta, & Faria, 2018).

Concluding remarks

The present work shows how a decay in diversity within one trophic level (e.g. consumers) may compromise ecological processes, when the phylogenetic lineages and the traits determining species susceptibility to disturbance are also driving the matching of trophic interactions. Indeed, a cascade effect is to be expected, by which the response of one trophic level to disturbance will impact on the fitness of the other trophic level involved. In our specific case, from the point of view of plants, we might also assume that some indirect, negative consequences will emerge from bird functional decay, as the loss of specialized seed dispersers has been found to decrease the magnitude of seed deposition in this study system (García et al., 2018). We therefore argue that our findings can be extended to different trophic processes (e.g. pollination, herbivory, seed predation) performed by plant and animal assemblages harboring diverse lineages and phenotypic traits which are involved in interaction matching, and confronted by common scenarios of anthropogenic disturbance.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank Carlos Guardado and Juan Rodríguez for technical support. The research was funded by MinECo/FEDER grants CGL2011-28430 and CGL2015-68963-C2-2-R to D.G., and BES2012-052863 and BES-2016-078260 to I.D. and R.P., respectively. I.D. is currently funded by the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation. Fieldwork was conducted with the permission of the Government of Asturias. Authors' contributions: D.G., M.S. and R.P. conceived and designed the study; D.G., J.R-P. and I.D. collected field data; R.P. and M.S. collected phylogenetic and trait data and performed analyses; R.P. and D.G. wrote the manuscript; all authors reviewed the manuscript and approved the final version.

REFERENCES

- Bates, D., Maechler, M., Bolker, B., & Walker, S. (2015). Fitting Linear Mixed-Effects Models Using lme4. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 67(1), 1–48.
- Blüthgen, N., & Klein, A. M. (2011). Functional complementarity and specialisation: The role of biodiversity in plant-pollinator interactions. *Basic and Applied Ecology*, 12(4), 282–291. doi: 10.1016/j.baae.2010.11.001
- Blüthgen, N., Menzel, F., & Blüthgen, N. (2006). Measuring specialization in species interaction networks. *BMC Ecology*, 6(1), 9. doi: 10.1186/1472-6785-6-9
- Bregman, T. P., Lees, A. C., MacGregor, H. E. A., Darski, B., de Moura, N. G., Aleixo, A., ... Tobias, J. A. (2016). Using avian functional traits to assess the impact of land-cover change on ecosystem processes linked to resilience in tropical forests. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 283(1844), 20161289. doi: 10.1098/rspb.2016.1289
- Bremer, B., Bremer, K., Chase, M. W., Fay, M. F., Reveal, J. L., Bailey, L. H., ... Stevens, P.

505 F. (2009). An update of the Angiosperm Phylogeny Group classification for the orders
506 and families of flowering plants: APG III. *Botanical Journal of the Linnean Society*,
507 161(2), 105–121. doi: 10.1111/j.1095-8339.2009.00996.x

508 Brousseau, P. M., Gravel, D., & Handa, I. T. (2017). Trait matching and phylogeny as
509 predictors of predator–prey interactions involving ground beetles. *Functional Ecology*,
510 32(1), 192–202. doi: 10.1111/1365-2435.12943

511 Cadotte, M., Dinnage, R., & Tilman, D. (2012). Phylogenetic diversity promotes ecosystem
512 stability. *Ecology*, 93(8), S223–S233. doi: 10.1890/11-0426.1

513 Cardinale, B. J., Duffy, J. E., Gonzalez, A., Hooper, D. U., Perrings, C., Venail, P., ...
514 Naeem, S. (2012). Biodiversity loss and its impact on humanity. *Nature*, 486(7401), 59–
515 67. doi: 10.1038/nature11148

516 Carnicer, J., Jordano, P., & Melián, C. J. (2009). The temporal dynamics of resource use by
517 frugivorous birds: a network approach. *Ecology*, 90(7), 1958–1970. doi: 10.1890/07-
518 1939.1

519 Coux, C., Rader, R., Bartomeus, I., & Tylianakis, J. M. (2016). Linking species functional
520 roles to their network roles. *Ecology Letters*, 19(7), 762–770. doi: 10.1111/ele.12612

521 Dehling, D. M., Fritz, S. A., Töpfer, T., Päckert, M., Estler, P., Böhning-Gaese, K., &
522 Schleuning, M. (2014). Functional and phylogenetic diversity and assemblage structure
523 of frugivorous birds along an elevational gradient in the tropical Andes. *Ecography*,
524 37(11), 1047–1055. doi: 10.1111/ecog.00623

525 Dehling, D. M., Jordano, P., Schaefer, H. M., Böhning-Gaese, K., & Schleuning, M. (2016).
526 Morphology predicts species' functional roles and their degree of specialization in
527 plant–frugivore interactions. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*,

528 283(1823), 20152444. doi: 10.1098/rspb.2015.2444

529 Dehling, D. M., Töpfer, T., Schaefer, H. M., Jordano, P., Böhning-Gaese, K., & Schleuning,
530 M. (2014). Functional relationships beyond species richness patterns: trait matching in
531 plant-bird mutualisms across scales. *Global Ecology and Biogeography*, 23(10), 1085–
532 1093. doi: 10.1111/geb.12193

533 Díaz, S., Purvis, A., Cornelissen, J. H. C., Mace, G. M., Donoghue, M. J., Ewers, R. M., ...
534 Pearse, W. D. (2013). Functional traits, the phylogeny of function, and ecosystem
535 service vulnerability. *Ecology and Evolution*, 3(9), 2958–2975. doi: 10.1002/ece3.601

536 Dirzo, R., Young, H. S., Galetti, M., Ceballos, G., Isaac, N. J. B., & Collen, B. (2014).
537 Defaunation in the Anthropocene. *Science*, 345(6195), 401–406. doi:
538 10.1126/science.1251817

539 Dormann, C.F. (2011). How to be a specialist? Quantifying specialisation in pollination
540 networks. *Network Biology*, 1(1), 1–20.

541 Dormann, C. F., Fründ, J., & Schaefer, H. M. (2017). Identifying Causes of Patterns in
542 Ecological Networks: Opportunities and Limitations. *Annual Review of Ecology,*
543 *Evolution, and Systematics*, 48(1), annurev-ecolsys-110316-022928. doi:
544 10.1146/annurev-ecolsys-110316-022928

545 Drummond, A. J., & Rambaut, A. (2007). BEAST: Bayesian evolutionary analysis by
546 sampling trees. *BMC Evolutionary Biology*, 7(1), 214. doi: 10.1186/1471-2148-7-214

547 Dunning, J. B. J. (2008). *CRC Handbook of avian body masses* (Second Edi; J. John B.
548 Dunning, ed.). CRC press.

549 Durka, W., & Michalski, S. G. (2012). Daphne: a dated phylogeny of a large European flora
550 for phylogenetically informed ecological analyses. *Ecology*, 93(10), 2297. doi:

10.1890/12-0743.1

- Ericson, P. G. ., Anderson, C. L., Britton, T., Elzanowski, A., Johansson, U. S., Kallersjo, M., ... Mayr, G. (2006). Diversification of Neoaves: integration of molecular sequence data and fossils. *Biology Letters*, 2(4), 543–547. doi: 10.1098/rsbl.2006.0523
- Farwig, N., Schabo, D. G., & Albrecht, J. (2017). Trait-associated loss of frugivores in fragmented forest does not affect seed removal rates. *Journal of Ecology*, 105(1), 20–28. doi: 10.1111/1365-2745.12669
- Fleming, T. H. (1991). Fruiting plant-frugivore mutualism: the evolutionary theater and the ecological play. In P. W. Price, T. M. Lewinsohn, G. W. Fernandes, & W. W. Benson (Eds.), *Plant-animal interactions: evolutionary ecology in tropical and temperate regions*. (pp. 119–144). Wiley, New York.
- Gagic, V., Bartomeus, I., Jonsson, T., Taylor, A., Winqvist, C., Fischer, C., ... Bommarco, R. (2015). Functional identity and diversity of animals predict ecosystem functioning better than species-based indices. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 282(1801), 20142620. doi: 10.1098/rspb.2014.2620
- García, D., Donoso, I., & Rodríguez-Pérez, J. (2018). Frugivore biodiversity and complementarity in interaction networks enhance landscape-scale seed dispersal function. *Functional Ecology*, 32(12), 2742–2752. doi: 10.1111/1365-2435.13213
- García, D., & Obeso, J. R. (2003). Facilitation by herbivore-mediated nurse plants in a threatened tree. *Ecography*, 26(6), 739–750.
- García, D., Quevedo, M., Obeso, J. R., & Abajo, A. (2005). Fragmentation patterns and protection of montane forest in the Cantabrian range (NW Spain). *Forest Ecology and Management*, 208(1–3), 29–43. doi: 10.1016/j.foreco.2004.10.071

574 García, D., Zamora, R., & Amico, G. C. (2011). The spatial scale of plant-animal
575 interactions: effects of resource availability and habitat structure. *Ecological*
576 *Monographs*, 81(1), 103–121. doi: 10.1890/10-0470.1

577 González-Varo, J. P. (2010). Fragmentation, habitat composition and the dispersal/predation
578 balance in interactions between the mediterranean myrtle and avian frugivores.
579 *Ecography*, 33(1), 185–197. doi: 10.1111/j.1600-0587.2009.06021.x

580 Helmus, M. R., Keller, W., Paterson, M. J., Yan, N. D., Cannon, C. H., & Rusak, J. A.
581 (2010). Communities contain closely related species during ecosystem disturbance.
582 *Ecology Letters*, 13(2), 162–174. doi: 10.1111/j.1461-0248.2009.01411.x

583 Jetz, W., Thomas, G. H., Joy, J. B., Hartmann, K., & Mooers, A. O. (2012). The global
584 diversity of birds in space and time. *Nature*, 491(7424), 444–448. doi:
585 10.1038/nature11631

586 Jordano, P. (2000). Fruits and frugivory. In *Seeds: the ecology of regeneration in plant*
587 *communities*. doi: 10.1079/9780851994321.0125

588 Jordano, P. (2014). Fruits and frugivory. In Robert S Gallagher (Ed.), *Seeds. The ecology of*
589 *regeneration in plant communities* (3rd ed., pp. 18–61). doi:
590 10.1079/9780851994321.0125

591 Kembel, S. W., Cowan, P. D., Helmus, M. R., Cornwell, W. K., Morlon, H., Ackerly, D. D.,
592 ... Webb, C. O. (2010). Picante: R tools for integrating phylogenies and ecology.
593 *Bioinformatics*, 26, 1463–1464.

594 Laliberté, E., & Legendre, P. (2010). A distance-based framework for measuring functional
595 diversity from multiple traits. 91(1), 299–305. doi: 10.1890/08-2244.1

596 Laliberté, E., Legendre, P., & Shipley, B. (2014). *FD: measuring functional diversity from*

597 *multiple traits, and other tools for functional ecology. R package version 1.0-12.*

598 Laliberté, E., Wells, J. A., Declerck, F., Metcalfe, D. J., Catterall, C. P., Queiroz, C., ...

599 Mayfield, M. M. (2010). Land-use intensification reduces functional redundancy and

600 response diversity in plant communities. *Ecology Letters*, 13(1), 76–86. doi:

601 10.1111/j.1461-0248.2009.01403.x

602 Lavorel, S., & Garnier, E. (2002). Predicting changes in community composition and

603 ecosystem functioning from plant traits: revisiting the Holy Grail. *Funct Ecology*, 16(5),

604 545–556.

605 Lavorel, S., Storkey, J., Bardgett, R. D., De Bello, F., Berg, M. P., Le Roux, X., ...

606 Harrington, R. (2013). A novel framework for linking functional diversity of plants with

607 other trophic levels for the quantification of ecosystem services. *Journal of Vegetation*

608 *Science*, 24(5), 942–948. doi: 10.1111/jvs.12083

609 Letten, A. D., & Cornwell, W. K. (2015). Trees, branches and (square) roots: why

610 evolutionary relatedness is not linearly related to functional distance. *Methods in*

611 *Ecology and Evolution*, 6(4), 439–444. doi: 10.1111/2041-210X.12237

612 Lososová, Z., de Bello, F., Chytrý, M., Kühn, I., Pyšek, P., Sádlo, J., ... Zelený, D. (2015).

613 Alien plants invade more phylogenetically clustered community types and cause even

614 stronger clustering. *Global Ecology and Biogeography*, 24(7), 786–794. doi:

615 10.1111/geb.12317

616 Martínez, D., & García, D. (2015). Disentangling habitat use by frugivorous birds : constant

617 interactive effects of forest cover and fruit availability. *Basic and Applied Ecology*,

618 16(5), 460–468. doi: 10.1016/j.baae.2015.04.012

619 Martínez, D., & García, D. (2017). Role of avian seed dispersers in tree recruitment in

620 woodland pastures. *Ecosystems*, 20(3), 616–629. doi: 10.1007/s10021-016-0043-6

621 McConkey, K. R., Prasad, S., Corlett, R. T., Campos-Arceiz, A., Brodie, J. F., Rogers, H., &
622 Santamaria, L. (2012). Seed dispersal in changing landscapes. *Biological Conservation*,
623 146(1), 1–13. doi: 10.1016/j.biocon.2011.09.018

624 Miklós, I., & Podani, J. (2004). Randomization of presence-absence matrices: comments and
625 new algorithms. *Ecology*, 85(1), 86–92. doi: 10.1890/03-0101

626 Morante-Filho, J. C., Arroyo-Rodríguez, V., Pessoa, M. de S., Cazetta, E., & Faria, D.
627 (2018). Direct and cascading effects of landscape structure on tropical forest and non-
628 forest frugivorous birds. *Ecological Applications*, 28(8), 2024–2032. doi:
629 10.1002/eap.1791

630 Moretti, M., De Bello, F., Ibanez, S., Fontana, S., Pezzatti, G. B., Dziock, F., ... Lavorel, S.
631 (2013). Linking traits between plants and invertebrate herbivores to track functional
632 effects of land-use changes. *Journal of Vegetation Science*, 24(5), 949–962. doi:
633 10.1111/jvs.12022

634 Naniwadekar, R., Chaplod, S., Datta, A., Rathore, A., & Sridhar, H. (2019). Large frugivores
635 matter: insights from network and seed dispersal effectiveness approaches. *Journal of*
636 *Animal Ecology*, 88(8), 1250–1262. doi: 10.1111/1365-2656.13005

637 Oksanen, J., Blanchet, F. G., Kindt, R., Legendre, P., Minchin, P. R., O'hara, R. B., ...
638 Wagner, H. (2018). Vegan: community ecology package. *R Package Version 2.4-6*. doi:
639 10.1093/molbev/msv334

640 Paradis, E., & Schliep, K. (2018). ape 5.0: an environment for modern phylogenetics and
641 evolutionary analyses in R. *Bioinformatics*.

642 Petchey, O. L., Evans, K. L., Fishburn, I. S., & Gaston, K. J. (2007). Low functional diversity

643 and no redundancy in British avian assemblages. *Journal of Animal Ecology*, 76(5),
644 977–985. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2656.2007.01271.x

645 Pigot, A. L., Bregman, T., Sheard, C., Daly, B., Etienne, R. S., & Tobias, J. A. (2016).
646 Quantifying species contributions to ecosystem processes: a global assessment of
647 functional trait and phylogenetic metrics across avian seed-dispersal networks.
648 *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 283(1844), 20161597. doi:
649 10.1098/rspb.2016.1597

650 Pires, M. M., Galetti, M., Donatti, C. I., Pizo, M. A., Dirzo, R., & Guimarães, P. R. (2014).
651 Reconstructing past ecological networks: The reconfiguration of seed-dispersal
652 interactions after megafaunal extinction. *Oecologia*, 175(4), 1247–1256. doi:
653 10.1007/s00442-014-2971-1

654 Plein, M., Langsfeld, L., Neuschulz, E. L., Schultheiss, C., Ingmann, L., Topfer, T., ...
655 Schleuning, M. (2013). Constant properties of plant-frugivore networks despite
656 fluctuations in fruit and bird communities in space and time. *Ecology*, 94(6), 1296–1306.
657 doi: 10.1890/12-1213.1

658 Quintero, E., Pizo, M. A., & Jordano, P. (2020). Fruit resource provisioning for avian
659 frugivores: the overlooked side of seed dispersal effectiveness. *Journal of Ecology*, In
660 press.

661 Reiss, J., Bridle, J. R., Montoya, J. M., & Woodward, G. (2009). Emerging horizons in
662 biodiversity and ecosystem functioning research. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution*,
663 24(9), 505–514. doi: 10.1016/j.tree.2009.03.018

664 Rezende, E. L., Lavabre, J. E., Guimarães Jr, P. R., Jordano, P., & Bascompte, J. (2007).
665 Non-random coextinctions in phylogenetically structured mutualistic networks. *Nature*,
666 448(7156), 925–928. doi: 10.1038/nature05956

667 Ribeiro, E. M. S., Santos, B. A., Arroyo-Rodríguez, V., Tabarelli, M., Souza, G., & Leal, I.
668 R. (2016). Phylogenetic impoverishment of plant communities following chronic human
669 disturbances in the Brazilian Caatinga. *Ecology*, 97(6), 1583–1592. doi: 10.1890/15-
670 1122.1

671 Saracco, J. F., Collazo, J. A., & Groom, M. J. (2004). How do frugivores track resources?
672 Insights from spatial analyses of bird foraging in a tropical forest. *Oecologia*, 139(2),
673 235–245. doi: 10.1007/s00442-004-1493-7

674 Schleuning, M., Fründ, J., & García, D. (2015). Predicting ecosystem functions from
675 biodiversity and mutualistic networks: an extension of trait-based concepts to plant-
676 animal interactions. *Ecography*, 38(4), 380–392. doi: 10.1111/ecog.00983

677 Schleuning, M., Ingmann, L., Strauß, R., Fritz, S. A., Dalsgaard, B., Dehling, M. D., ...
678 Dormann, C. F. (2014). Ecological, historical and evolutionary determinants of
679 modularity in weighted seed-dispersal networks. *Ecology Letters*, 17(4), 454–463. doi:
680 10.1111/ele.12245

681 Selås, V. (2017). Autumn irruptions of Eurasian Jay (*Garrulus glandarius*) in Norway in
682 relation to acorn production and weather. *Ornis Fennica*, 94(2), 92–100.

683 Simmons, B. I., Sutherland, W. J., Dicks, L. V., Albrecht, J., Farwig, N., García, D., ...
684 González-Varo, J. P. (2018). Moving from frugivory to seed dispersal: incorporating the
685 functional outcomes of interactions in plant-frugivore networks. *Journal of Animal*
686 *Ecology*, 87(4), 995–1007. doi: 10.1111/1365-2656.12831

687 Suding, K. N., Lavorel, S., Chapin, F. S., Cornelissen, J. H. C., Díaz, S., Garnier, E., ...
688 Navas, M. L. (2008). Scaling environmental change through the community-level: a
689 trait-based response-and-effect framework for plants. *Global Change Biology*, 14(5),
690 1125–1140. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2486.2008.01557.x

691 Tilman, D., & Downing, J. A. (1994). Biodiversity and stability in grasslands. *Nature*,
692 367(6461), 363–365. doi: 10.1038/367363a0

693 Valiente-Banuet, A., Aizen, M. A., Alcántara, J. M., Arroyo, J., Cocucci, A., Galetti, M., ...
694 Zamora, R. (2015). Beyond species loss: The extinction of ecological interactions in a
695 changing world. *Functional Ecology*, 29(3), 299–307. doi: 10.1111/1365-2435.12356

696 Villéger, S., Mason, N. W. H., & Mouillot, D. (2008). New multidimensional functional
697 diversity indices for a multifaceted framework in functional ecology. *Ecology*, 89(8),
698 2290–2301. doi: 10.1890/07-1206.1

699

700 **Table 1.** Linear mixed-effect models testing the response of biodiversity components
701 (phylogenetic diversity MPD, trait-based functional diversity FDis) of (a) plants and (b) birds
702 to forest cover (log-transformed). The parameter estimates are given in standardized form.
703 The type of biodiversity component and its interaction with forest cover were also considered
704 as fixed effects. Plot was incorporated as a random effect.

705

Trophic level	Fixed effect	Estimate	Std. Error	t-value	P
(a) Plants	Intercept	0.31	0.51	0.61	0.551
	Forest cover	0.27	0.30	0.91	0.377
	Biodiversity component (FDis)	0.17	0.64	0.26	0.794
	Forest Cover x FDis	-0.02	0.37	-0.04	0.968
(b) Birds	Intercept	1.52	0.52	2.94	0.006
	Forest cover	1.03	0.30	3.42	0.002
	Biodiversity component (FDis)	-1.03	0.57	-1.81	0.081
	Forest cover x FDis	-0.52	0.33	-1.58	0.125

706

707 **Table 2.** Linear mixed-effect models testing the effect of (a) phylogenetic diversity (MPD)
708 and (b) trait-based functional diversity (FDis) on functional complementarity ($\langle d' \rangle$) of two
709 trophic levels (plants and birds). The parameter estimates are given in standardized form..
710 Models included trophic level and its interaction with MDP or FDis as fixed effects. Plot
711 identity was incorporated as a random effect.

	Fixed effects	Estimate	Std. Error	t-value	P
(a) Phylogenetic diversity					
	Intercept	-0.50	0.16	-3.14	0.005
	Trophic level (Plant)	0.60	0.23	2.66	0.014
	MPD	0.54	0.13	4.14	<0.001
	MPD x Plant	-0.44	0.20	-2.21	0.038
(b) Trait-based functional diversity					
	Intercept	-0.34	0.12	-2.83	0.009
	Trophic level (Plant)	0.36	0.14	2.53	0.018
	FDis	0.66	0.11	5.87	<0.001
	FDis x Plant	0.08	0.18	0.43	0.670

Figure captions

Figure 1. Conceptual model relating ecological processes to anthropogenic disturbance through the response to and the effect of biodiversity components applied to frugivory under forest loss. The response of consumer (frugivore) and resource (plant) organisms to disturbance may be addressed by integrative biodiversity components beyond taxonomic diversity, such as phylogenetic and trait-based functional diversity. These two components are also predictors of ecological function, which can be estimated as the combination of the functional contributions of different species to interaction networks. Artwork by Daniel García (song thrush) and Víctor González (hawthorn).

Figure 2. Relationship between components of biodiversity (phylogenetic diversity MPD, darker shades; trait-based functional diversity FDis, lighter shades) and the proportion of forest cover for a) plants and b) birds. Dots represent standardized effect size values of metrics in different plots. Logarithmic trend lines indicate statistically significant relationships.

Figure 3. Relationships between a) phylogenetic diversity (MPD) and b) trait-based functional diversity (FDis) and functional complementarity in the plant-frugivore interaction network ($\langle d' \rangle$). Dots represent standardized effect size values of metrics in different plots, and trend lines, statistically significant relationships between variables, for plants (blue) and birds (orange).

Figure 2

743

744 **Figure 3**

745

746

747

748