Original article

Do alpine plants facilitate each other's pollination? Experiments at a small spatial scale

Yasemin Sieber^a, Rolf Holderegger^{a,*}, Nickolas M. Waser^b, Vera F. D. Thomas^c, Sabine Braun^c, Andreas Erhardt^d, Heinz-Ulrich Reyer^e, Lea R. Wirth^a

^a*WSL Swiss Federal Research Institute, CH-8903 Birmensdorf, Switzerland*

^b*School of Natural Resources and the Environment, University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ 85721, USA*

^c*Institute for Applied Plant Biology IAP, CH-4124 Schönenbuch, Switzerland*

^d*Department of Environmental Sciences, University of Basel, CH-4056 Basel, Switzerland*

^e*Institute for Evolutionary Biology and Environmental Studies, University of Zürich, CH-8057 Zürich, Switzerland*

* Corresponding author. Tel: +41 44 739 25 27; fax: +41 44 739 22 15

E-mail address: rolf.holderegger@wsl.ch (Rolf Holderegger)

This document is the accepted manuscript version of the following article:
Sieber, Y., Holderegger, R., Waser, N. M., Thomas, V. F. D., Braun, S., Erhardt, A., ...
Wirth, L. R. (2011). Do alpine plants facilitate each other's pollination? Experiments at
a small spatial scale. *Acta Oecologica*, 37(4), 369-374.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actao.2011.04.005>

ABSTRACT

Short growing seasons, low temperatures, and frequent strong wind classify high mountains as adverse environments, in which pollinator abundance and activity are reduced. In such environments, plants growing in dense stands comprising several species and thus exhibiting larger and more diverse flower displays may profit by attracting more visits from scarce alpine pollinators than do plants that grow alone or in patches only composed of conspecifics. To study whether aggregation of plants increases (facilitation) or decreases (competition) the attraction of pollinators, we measured the rate and numbers with which insects entered experimental plots in the Swiss Alps, and their behaviour at flowers in plots that they entered. The plots contained individuals of the blue-flowering cushion plant *Eritrichium nanum*, either alone or mixed with white- to yellow-flowering *Saxifraga* species. Pollinators were generally rare: in 55% of 236 observation periods, no pollinators were observed. Over 95% of the pollinators were Diptera. The average probability of observing any insect at all was higher in plots that contained some *Saxifraga* flowers, including mixed plots, than in those containing only *E. nanum* flowers. However, although insects tended to choose *Saxifraga* as the first flower visited in mixed plots, in all other regards their visitation of *Saxifraga* and *E. nanum* flowers in such plots was statistically indistinguishable. We also detected no effect of floral neighbourhood on the frequencies of potentially geitonogamous visits or of transitions among individual plants of the same or different species. Thus, our study suggests that the presence of *Saxifraga* may facilitate visitation to *E. nanum* at larger spatial scales, but gives no evidence for either competition or facilitation at small scales within floral neighbourhoods.

Keywords: Attractiveness; Competition; Facilitation; Floral display; *Eritrichium nanum*; Pollinator behaviour; *Saxifraga*

1. Introduction

Plant species can exert negative, positive, or neutral effects on each other, both directly and indirectly. Direct effects involve the immediate environment of individuals, and are mostly assumed to be negative, i.e., competition for shared and limited resources such as light, water, and nutrients (e.g., Keddy, 2001). However, recent studies suggest that positive interactions, i.e., facilitation, are common in physically adverse environments (Choler et al., 2001; Callaway et al., 2002; Holzapfel et al., 2006). In alpine environments, for instance, experimental removal of neighbouring plants revealed a shift of effects from competition at low elevation to facilitation at high elevation (Choler et al., 2001; Callaway et al., 2002). Neighbouring plants at high elevations can apparently mitigate the negative effects of the abiotic alpine environment (i.e., short growing season, low temperature, strong wind) and thereby enhance each other's growth and reproduction more strongly than these are impaired by competition (Callaway et al., 2002).

Among the possible indirect interactions among individual plants are those involving the service of insect pollinators, which also respond to severe environmental conditions such as those found in the alpine (Cruden, 1972; Kevan, 1975; Totland, 1993; Garcia-Camacho and Totland, 2009). Reduced pollinator abundance, activity, and diversity at high elevations have been reported in several studies (Schröter, 1926; Cruden, 1972, Arroyo et al., 1982; 2006; Bingham and Orthner, 1998). With limited pollinator services, increasing attractiveness to pollinators may be crucial for the reproduction of high-alpine plants. Compared to single individuals or patches of conspecifics, different species growing together might be particularly attractive to pollinators due to their larger and more diverse floral displays, i.e., pollination facilitation (Thomson, 1982; Rathcke, 1983). Contrasting flower shapes, colours, and odors in plant aggregations might be conspicuous to the visual or chemical sensory systems of pollinators, and mixed patches might be visited more often (Thomson, 1978; Sih

and Baltus, 1987; Lavery and Plowright, 1988). However, enhanced attractiveness can also have negative consequences if it entails transfer of pollen between species, a form of competition for pollination services (Waser, 1978; Rathcke, 1983; Mitchell et al., 2009). Furthermore, insects may sequentially visit many flowers on plants with large floral displays, leading to geitonogamous selfing, which could reduce the number and fitness of offspring (Charlesworth and Charlesworth, 1987; de Jong et al., 1993). This effect of increased geitonogamy has been shown for some mixtures of species (Thomson, 1978; Brown and Kodric-Brown, 1979; Lavery and Plowright, 1988; Lavery, 1992).

Pollination facilitation has been investigated before (Thomson, 1978, 1982; Sih and Baltus, 1987; Moeller, 2004; Ghazoul, 2006; Hansen et al., 2007), but we are unaware of studies in alpine environments. Here we report on a study of the alpine cushion plant *Eritrichium nanum*, with insect-pollinated blue flowers, and its common neighbours, white- to yellowish-flowered *Saxifraga* species (Gams 1975). By observing insects in experimental plots in the Swiss Alps, we could determine (1) whether plots containing both *E. nanum* and *Saxifraga* were approached more often by pollinators than those not containing mixtures; (2) whether insects preferred one or the other species within mixed plots; and (3) whether sequential flower visits on the same individuals of *E. nanum* or *Saxifraga*, potentially leading to geitonogamy, increased in mixed associations.

2. Materials and Methods

2.1 Study species and sites

Eritrichium nanum (L.) Gaud. (Boraginaceae) is a long-lived high-alpine cushion plant common at elevations between 2500 and 3000m a.s.l. in the European Alps (Gams, 1975). Cushions produce bright blue, self-compatible flowers (Wirth et al., 2010), which offer nectar at their base (Zoller et al., 2002). The species is confined to siliceous bedrock and is

commonly associated with *Saxifraga exarata* ssp. *exarata* Vill. and *S. bryoides* L. (Saxifragaceae). These two long-lived *Saxifraga* species are perennial, subalpine to alpine plants (Kaplan, 1995). In contrast to *E. nanum*, their white to yellowish flowers offer nectar that is openly accessible (Kaplan, 1995). Flies are the main pollinators of all these plant species, which flower simultaneously between June and August (Zoller et al., 2002).

We worked in the Upper Engadine and adjacent valleys (Canton of Grisons, southeastern Switzerland) from the middle of June to the end of July 2006. We chose seven study sites with sparse vegetation at elevations between 2770 and 3050m a.s.l., separated from each other by at least 1 km (Table 1).

2.2 Experimental design and pollinator observation

Depending on the topography and area of the sites, we established different numbers of experimental plots at each site ($n = 60$ plots total; Table 1). Plots were separated by distances of more than 100m as well as by rocky outcrops, rock terraces, or rugged terrain. Each plot consisted of an inner circle of 0.5m radius surrounded by an outer ring of 1.5m radius, the latter containing ten flowering *E. nanum* cushions, but no other flowering species (Fig. 1). Four treatments were established in the inner circle: (1) three *E. nanum* cushions (En; low density), (2) eleven *E. nanum* cushions (En+En; high density), (3) three *E. nanum* cushions with *S. exarata* ssp. *exarata* and *S. bryoides* as neighbours (En+S; high mixed density) and (4) only *Saxifraga* individuals (S+S; high density). Desired numbers of co-flowering plants in the inner circles and in the outer rings of plots were obtained by manually de-flowering all other plants as well as surplus *E. nanum* and *Saxifraga*. We trimmed flowers in the inner circles of plots to produce floral displays that were as similar in size as was practical to achieve; continued opening of flowers, however, led to some variation among plots in overall flower number at any given time.

To explore pollinator-mediated interactions between *E. nanum* and the two *Saxifraga* species as well as potential effects of different plant densities, we observed insects at flowers in the inner circle of each plot during 10-min periods spread nearly evenly across morning (between 0900–1130 hours), midday (1130–1400) and afternoon (1400–1630). A total of 236 observation periods resulted in an overall observation duration of ca. 40 h across 20 days. Because of the general scarcity of insect flower visitors in the Alpine (Schröter, 1926; Arroyo et al., 1982, 1985), the usual approach of recording rates of visitation to single flowers or individuals would have resulted in many zero observations. Therefore, we first counted the number of insects found in the inner circle of each plot being observed at the beginning and at the end of each observation period. Second, we focused on the behaviour of single pollinators during each observation period. When the first insect entered a study plot being observed, we followed this insect until it left the study plot. Subsequently, another pollinator was observed and so on until the 10-min period was over. For each visitor being followed, we determined the species identity of the first flower visited (only in treatment En+S), the number of visited flowers per plant species, potential geitonogamy (i.e. the number of transitions from one flower to another flower of the same plant individual) and the number of transitions of visitors between cushions of the same or different species. We also counted the numbers of open flowers of *E. nanum* and *Saxifraga* species in each study plot and recorded the weather conditions in three broad classes (sunny and no wind, cloudy and/or weak wind and rainy and/or strong wind). Visitors were classified into four broad taxonomic groups: hoverflies (Syrphidae), other flies (Diptera), bees (Hymenoptera), and beetles (Coleoptera).

2.3. Statistical analysis

We analyzed presence/absence of visitors in plots during observation periods across treatments with logistic regression using JMP 7.0.1 (SAS, Cary, USA). To all other data, general linear models were applied using SPSS 14.0 (SPSS, Chicago, USA). The effect of treatment on the mean number of visitors at the beginning and at the end of an observation period was tested with post-hoc Bonferroni pairwise comparisons. Table 2 gives an overview of the statistical approaches, dependent variables, data transformations, factors and covariates used. We always started with full models, but in cases where the interaction terms were not significant, we dropped them from analysis. Examination of residuals indicated no deviations from normal distributions.

3. Results

3.1. Attractiveness of study plots

Of 366 insects observed to visit flowers, 0.5% were bees and 2% beetles, while the remaining 97.5% were flies, including 3% hoverflies. We saw no visitors at all in 129 of the 236 10-min observation periods (55%). The probability of observing visitors varied across the seven study sites (Table 1), with the highest value (visitors seen in 73% of observation periods) at site 4, somewhat lower values (ca. 50%) at sites 1 and 7, and the lowest values (ca. 33%) at the four remaining sites. The probability of observing visitors declined significantly under rainy weather conditions with strong wind (Table 2a; Fig. 2c), while it increased with the total number of open flowers in a study plot (Table 2a). Finally, abundance of visitors significantly increased with increasing number of flowers per plot (Table 2b).

The probability of seeing any visitors at all during an observation period was significantly higher in plots including *Saxifraga* species (treatments En+S and S+S) than in the treatments containing *E. nanum* alone (Fig. 2a, Table 2a). When we averaged the numbers

of insects present at the beginning and at the end of the 10-min period in the observation periods with insects present, however, this average was significantly greater only in plots with *Saxifraga* alone (treatment S+S; Fig. 2b, Table 2b); all other treatments (including En+S) were statistically indistinguishable. Treatment S+S also had the highest total number of visitors, and it was visited by all four insect groups (Fig. 2d).

3.2. Behaviour of visitors

We followed a total of 321 individual insects visiting flowers in the experimental plots. The ranking of the total numbers of visitors followed in each of the four treatments resembled that for the mean numbers of visitors at the beginning and end of each observation period: 31 visitors in treatment En, 47 in En+En, 123 in En+S and 120 in S+S. In treatment En+S, *E. nanum* was chosen as the first flower visited by only 14 insects (11.4%), whereas *Saxifraga* was first approached in the remaining 109 cases (88.6%). However, we detected no significant difference in any other aspect of insect behavioural response to the two species that we analyzed (Table 2c–2h). The mean percentage of flowers visited per 10-min period was equivalent for *E. nanum* and *Saxifraga* spp. ($10.4 \pm 1.4\%$ versus $10.4 \pm 0.9\%$ SE), although the percentage of *Saxifraga* flowers visited increased in good weather and with increasing numbers of flowers in a plot (Table 2d, 2f). The mean numbers of *E. nanum* and *Saxifraga* flowers visited while we followed individual insects were also very similar (respectively 7.3 ± 1.0 and 7.5 ± 0.9), and so were the mean numbers of potentially-geitonogamous visits (i.e. average number of flowers visited on the same plant after the first flower of that plant had been visited; 5.5 ± 0.9 in both cases). The mean number of potentially-geitonogamous visits to *Saxifraga* flowers varied across the seven study sites, with a range of about two to ten flowers visited per plant on average. We also detected some significant site x treatment interactions (Table 2d, e, g). Pollinators

195 rarely moved between individuals of the same or different species. We only saw ten insects
196 flying between *E. nanum* cushions (3.1% of all insects observed), only 29 between *Saxifraga*
197 cushions (9%), and only four between *E. nanum* and *Saxifraga* cushions (1.2%).

199 4. Discussion

200 The absence of pollinators from about half of our observations agrees with other reports
201 of low pollinator presence and activity at high elevations (e.g., Bingham and Orther, 1998;
202 Arroyo et al., 2006). This is not surprising: one is immediately struck by the relative rarity of
203 insects when ascending from a species-rich meadow at 2000m in the Alps to a wind-blown
204 scree slope at 3000m. The rapidly changing and severe weather conditions at higher
205 elevations strongly reduce insect flight.

206 One potential consequence of this scarcity of pollinators is that plants growing in
207 aggregations with other species and flowering simultaneously might attract more pollinators.
208 Our results with *E. nanum* and *Saxifraga* spp., however, present a more complex picture.
209 Plots containing *E. nanum* alone attracted visitors less often than treatments containing
210 *Saxifraga*, including those with a mixture of *Saxifraga* and *E. nanum*. However, when we
211 look at those plots that did attract insects, the numbers of insects did not differ significantly
212 among treatments. Thus the earlier hypothesis of Zoller et al. (2002), that *Saxifraga* species
213 attract pollinators away from *E. nanum* was not confirmed when one considers mixtures of
214 the species as neighbours. Competition between neighbouring *E. nanum* and *Saxifraga* via
215 interspecific transfer of pollen (e.g., Mitchell et al. 2009) also seems unlikely, given how
216 rarely we observed insects flying from one species to another.

217 It certainly is possible that we are observing two apparently-contradictory effects. First,
218 the presence of some *Saxifraga* in a plot might send some sensory signal that attracts
219 insects at a higher rate (or provide a reward that causes them to return at a higher rate) than
220 is the case when no *Saxifraga* flowers are present. Once insects arrive, however, they

221 appear not to prefer *Saxifraga* relative to *E. nanum*. That this latter “neutral” interaction
222 (Rathcke, 1983) appears to dominate is suggested by results of a study on seed set in the
223 same system and conducted in the same region (Wirth et al. in press), which detected no
224 positive or negative effects of *Saxifraga* on the numbers of seeds produced by *E. nanum*
225 cushions.

226 Neutral interactions have been reported in other studies of pollinator number and
227 behaviour (Armbruster and McGuire, 1991; McGuire and Armbruster, 1991; Feldman, 2008).
228 The two studies by Armbruster and McGuire resemble ours by taking place in an adverse
229 pollination environment, the arctic tundra of interior Alaska. In contrast, most other studies of
230 pollinator visitation patterns have been carried out in more benign environments and have
231 provided evidence for either positive or negative interactions among co-flowering species
232 (e.g. Waser 1978; Thomson, 1978, 1982; Feinsinger et al., 1991; Laverty, 1992; Brown et
233 al., 2002; Johnson et al., 2003; Moeller, 2004; Bell et al., 2005; Ghazoul, 2006; Muñoz and
234 Cavieres, 2008; Peter and Johnson, 2008).

235 Even though the plant species in our study did not measurably influence rates of
236 visitation to neighbouring flowers and even though interspecific pollen transfer was unlikely,
237 high pollinator attractiveness might have harmful effects if it enhances geitonogamous self-
238 pollination and thus leads to loss of fitness in the offspring (Bell et al., 2005; Mitchell et al.,
239 2009). However, we detected no influence of mixed plant associations, higher plant
240 densities, or higher numbers of open flowers on potentially-geitonogamous visits in either *E.*
241 *nanum* or *Saxifraga* spp. To be sure, we observed only a few potentially-geitonogamous
242 visits overall, and so potentially had low statistical power to detect any significant effect.
243 However, our results find some parallels in the literature. For example, Bell et al. (2005)
244 recorded pollinator visits to *Mimulus ringens* growing with or without *Lobelia siphilitica*, and
245 detected no difference in geitonogamous visits between treatments. Robertson and Macnair

246 (1995) showed that *Myosotis colensoi* was not visited by more pollinators in a proportional
247 way when offering larger floral displays, just as we found with its relative *E. nanum*. In
248 contrast, several studies have detected enhanced geitonogamous visits with increasing
249 numbers of open flowers per plant (de Jong et al., 1992, 1993; Karron et al., 2004; Mitchell
250 et al., 2004; Ishii and Harder, 2006), or decreasing geitonogamous visits with increasing
251 plant density (Feldman 2006).

252 In complex natural landscapes, in which plants of different species are not distributed
253 uniformly in space, the precise way in which pollinators respond to different aggregations of
254 flowers will determine what patterns of visitation we may observe and whether they appear
255 as facilitative or competitive. The relevant behavioural responses of pollinators include the
256 likelihood that a single insect will perceive a patch of flowers and approach it, as well as how
257 this individual will forage within and among individual plants of one or more species once
258 there. Moreover, the responses must be combined across insects of the same and different
259 species, which may or may not respond independently of one another. These individual and
260 combined responses in a spatially-complex environment may be thought of as analogues of
261 the functional and numerical responses postulated by Holling (1959). It is tempting to
262 speculate on how features of the high alpine – severe physical conditions, scarcity of plants,
263 dominance of flies as pollinators, etc. – might elicit the visitation patterns that we detected,
264 and how features at lower elevations might elicit other patterns explaining reports of clear
265 competition or facilitation among neighbouring plants. However, speculation at this point is
266 of little value: too little is yet known about the frequency of facilitative, neutral, and
267 competitive interactions among plants mediated through pollination in different
268 environments, and too little is also known about insect sensory perception and cognition,
269 especially beyond a few species of social bees (Chittka and Raine, 2006), and in particular
270 for Alpine flies (A. Ssymank and J. Ziegler, personal communications).

271 The mechanisms by which individual and collective behaviour of pollinators leads to
272 fitness outcomes for plants, and how these mechanisms might depend on taxonomic and
273 other aspects of plants and animals, are rich areas for future exploration. In pursuit of this
274 goal the further interaction of fields such as plant ecology and cognitive behavioural biology
275 (e.g., Chittka and Thomson, 2001) is likely to be especially fruitful. In addition, an explicit
276 consideration of spatial scale will be an important part of future exploration. The fact that we
277 did not detect interactions between *E. nanum* and *Saxifraga* spp. at the scale of
278 neighbouring plants does not preclude interactions at larger spatial scales, as indeed is
279 suggested by the greater rate at which insects entered plots containing some *Saxifraga*.
280 Removing *Saxifraga* from the overall landscape might therefore strongly alter the identity of
281 insects present and their rate of visitation to *E. nanum*. The logistical difficulty of
282 manipulating plants or the sensory cues that they present on any but small scales has so far
283 kept us and other researchers from investigating such possible landscape-wide effects in a
284 more complete way.

285

286 **Acknowledgements**

287 We thank Urs Landergott for statistical advice, the authorities of several Swiss mountain
288 railways for free transportation, and the Department for Nature and Environment of the
289 Canton of Grisons for authorization to work with protected *E. nanum* and to manipulate
290 study plots. We also thank Mary Price for discussion and Conny Thiel-Egenter, Felix
291 Gugerli, Urs Kamm and two anonymous referees for helpful comments on the manuscript.
292 Joachim Ziegler and Axel Ssymank kindly commented on the behavior of alpine insects. The
293 work was financed by the Swiss National Science Foundation (3100A0-107962).

294

295 **References**

296 Armbruster, W.S., McGuire, A.D., 1991. Experimental assessment of reproductive
 297 interactions between sympatric *Aster* and *Erigeron* (Asteraceae) in interior Alaska. Am.
 298 J. Bot. 78, 1449-1457.

299 Arroyo, M.T.K., R. Primack, R., Armesto, J.J., 1982. Community studies in pollination
 300 ecology in the high temperate Andes of Central Chile. I. Pollination mechanisms and
 301 altitudinal variation. Am. J. Bot. 69, 82-97.

302 Arroyo, M.T.K., Armesto, J.J., Primack, R.B., 1985. Community studies in pollination ecology
 303 in the high temperate Andes of Central Chile. II. Effect of temperature on visitation
 304 rates and pollination possibilities. Plant Syst. Evol. 149, 187-203.

305 Arroyo, M.T.K., Muñoz, M.S., Henríquez, C., Till-Bottraud, I., Pérez, F., 2006. Erratic
 306 pollination, high selfing levels and their correlates and consequences in an altitudinally
 307 widespread above-tree-line species in the high Andes of Chile. Acta Oecol. 30, 248-
 308 257.

309 Bell, J.M., Karron, J.D., Mitchell, R.J., 2005. Interspecific competition for pollination lowers
 310 seed production and outcrossing in *Mimulus ringens*. Ecology 86, 762-771.

311 Bingham, R.A., Orthner, A.R., 1998. Efficient pollination of alpine plants. Nature 391, 238-
 312 239.

313 Brown, J.H., Kodric-Brown, A., 1979. Convergence, competition, and mimicry in a temperate
 314 community of hummingbird-pollinated flowers. Ecology 60, 1022-1035.

315 Brown, B.J., Mitchell, R.J., Graham, S.A., 2002. Competition for pollination between an
 316 invasive species (purple loosestrife) and a native congener. Ecology 83, 2328-2336.

317 Callaway, R.M., Brooker, R.W., Choler, P., Kikvidze, Z., Lortie, C.J., Michalet, R., Paolini, L.,
 318 Pugnaire, F.I., Newingham, B., Aschehoug, E.T., Armas, C., Kikodze, D., Cook, B.J.,
 319 2002. Positive interactions among alpine plants increase with stress. Nature 417, 844-
 320 848.

321 Charlesworth, D., Charlesworth, B., 1987. Inbreeding depression and its evolutionary
 322 consequences. *Annu. Rev. Ecol. Syst.* 18, 237-268.
 323 Chittka, L., Thompson, J.D., 2001. Cognitive ecology of pollination. Cambridge University
 324 Press, Cambridge.
 325 Chittka, L., Raine, N.E. 2006. Recognition of flowers by pollinators. *Curr. Opin. Plant Biol.* 9,
 326 428-435.
 327 Choler, P., Michalet, R., Callaway R.M., 2001. Facilitation and competition on gradients in
 328 alpine plant communities. *Ecology* 82, 3295-3308.
 329 Cruden, R.W., 1972. Pollinators in high-elevation ecosystems: relative effectiveness of birds
 330 and bees. *Science* 176, 1439-1440.
 331 de Jong, T.J., Waser, N.M., Price, M.V., Ring, R.M., 1992. Plant size, geitonogamy, and
 332 seed set in *Ipomopsis aggregata*. *Oecologia* 89, 310-315.
 333 de Jong, T.J., Waser, N.M., Klinkhamer, P.G.L., 1993. Geitonogamy – the neglected side of
 334 selfing. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* 8, 321-325.
 335 Feinsinger, P., Tiebout, H.M., Young, B.E., 1991. Do tropical bird-pollinated plants exhibit
 336 density-dependent interactions? *Ecology* 72, 1953-1963.
 337 Feldman, T.S., 2006. Pollinator aggregative and functional responses to flower density: does
 338 pollinator response to patches of plants accelerate at low-densities? *Oikos* 115, 128-
 339 140.
 340 Feldman, T.S., 2008. The plot thickens: does low density affect visitation and reproductive
 341 success in a perennial herb, and are these effects altered in the presence of a co-
 342 flowering species? *Oecologia* 156, 807-817.
 343 Gams, H., 1975. Boraginaceae. In: Berger, H. (Ed.), *Gustav Hegi, Illustrierte Flora von*
 344 *Mitteleuropa* V(3). Parey, Berlin, pp. 2122-2233.

345 Garcia-Camacho R., Totland Ø., 2009. Pollen limitation in the Alpine: a meta-analysis. *Arct.*
 346 *Antarc. Alp. Res.* 41, 103-111.
 347 Ghazoul, J., 2006. Floral diversity and the facilitation of pollination. *J. Ecol.* 94, 295-304.
 348 Hansen, D.M., Kiesbuy, H.C., Jones, C.G., Müller, C.B., 2007. Positive indirect interactions
 349 between neighbouring plant species via a lizard pollinator. *Am. Nat.* 169, 534-542.
 350 Holling, C.S., 1959. The components of predation as revealed by a study of small mammal
 351 predation of the European pine sawfly. *Canad. Entomol.* 91, 293-320.
 352 Holzapfel, C., Tielborger, K., Parag, H.A., Kigel, J., Sternberg, M., 2006. Annual plant-shrub
 353 interactions along an aridity gradient. *Basic Appl. Ecol.* 7, 268-279.
 354 Ishii, H.S., Harder, L.D., 2006. The size of individual *Delphinium* flowers and the opportunity
 355 for geitonogamous pollination. *Funct. Ecol.* 20, 1115-1123.
 356 Johnson, S.D., Peter, C.I., Nilsson, L.A., Ågren, J., 2003. Pollination success in a deceptive
 357 orchid is enhanced by co-occurring rewarding magnet plants. *Ecology* 84, 2919-2927.
 358 Kaplan, K., 1995. Saxifragaceae. In: Conert, H., Jäger, E., Kadereit, J., Schultze-Motel, W.,
 359 Wagenitz, G., Weber, H. (Eds.), *Gustav Hegi, Illustrierte Flora von Mitteleuropa IV(2A)*.
 360 Blackwell, Berlin, pp. 130-229.
 361 Karron, J.D., Mitchell, R.J., Holmquist, K.G., Bell, J.M., Funk, B., 2004. The influence of
 362 floral display size on selfing rates in *Mimulus ringens*. *Heredity* 92, 242-248.
 363 Keddy, P.A. 2001. *Competition*. Chapman and Hall, New York.
 364 Kevan, P.G., 1975. Sun-tracking solar furnaces in high arctic flowers: significance for
 365 pollination and insects. *Science* 189, 723-726.
 366 Lavery, T.M., 1992. Plant interactions for pollinator visits – a test of the magnet species
 367 effect. *Oecologia* 89, 502-508.

368 Lavery, T.M., Plowright, R.C., 1988. Fruit and seed set in Mayapple (*Podophyllum peltatum*)
 369 – influence of intraspecific factors and local enhancement near *Pedicularis canadensis*.
 370 Can. J. Bot. 66, 173-178.

371 McGuire, A.D., Armbruster, W.S., 1991. An experimental test for reproductive interactions
 372 between two sequentially blooming *Saxifraga* species (Saxifragaceae). Am. J. Bot. 78,
 373 214-219.

374 Mitchell, R.J., Karron, J.D., Holmquist, K.G., Bell, J.M., 2004. The influence of *Mimulus*
 375 *ringens* floral display size on pollinator visitation patterns. Funct. Ecol. 18, 116-124.

376 Mitchell, R.J., Flanagan, R.J., Brown, B.J, Waser, N.M., Karron, J.D., 2009. New frontiers in
 377 competition for pollination. Ann. Bot. 103, 1403-1413.

378 Moeller, D.A., 2004. Facilitative interactions among plants via shared pollinators. Ecology
 379 85, 3289-3301.

380 Muñoz, A.A., Cavieres, L.A., 2008. The presence of a showy invasive plant disrupts
 381 pollinator service and reproductive output in native alpine species only at high
 382 densities. J. Ecol. 96, 459-467.

383 Peter, C.I., Johnson, S.D., 2008. Mimics and magnets: the importance of colour and
 384 ecological facilitation in floral deception. Ecology 89, 1583-1595.

385 Rathcke, B., 1983. Competition and facilitation among plants for pollination. In: Real, L.A.
 386 (Ed.), Pollination biology. Academic Press, Orlando, pp. 305-329.

387 Robertson, A.W., Macnair, M.R., 1995. The effects of floral display size on pollinator service
 388 to individual flowers of *Myosotis* and *Mimulus*. Oikos 72, 106-114.

389 Schröter, C., 1926. Das Pflanzenleben der Alpen. Raustein, Zürich.

390 Sih, A., Baltus, M.S., 1987. Patch size, pollinator behavior, and pollinator limitation in catnip.
 391 Ecology 68, 1679-1690.

392 Thomson, J.D., 1978. Effects of stand composition on insect visitation in two species
 393 mixtures of *Hieracium*. Am. Midl. Nat. 100, 431-440.
 394 Thomson, J.D., 1982. Patterns of visitation by animal pollinators. Oikos 39, 241-250.
 395 Totland, Ø., 1993. Pollination in alpine Norway: flowering phenology, insect visitors, and
 396 visitation rates in two plant communities. Can. J. Bot. 71, 1072-1079.
 397 Waser, N.M., 1978. Competition for hummingbird pollination and sequential flowering in two
 398 Colorado wildflowers. Ecology 59, 934-944.
 399 Wirth, L.R., Graf, R., Gugerli, F., Landergott, U., Holderegger, R., 2010. Lower selfing rate at
 400 higher altitudes in the alpine plant *Eritrichium nanum* (Boraginaceae). Am. J. Bot. 97,
 401 899-901.
 402 Wirth, L. R., Waser, N. M., Graf, R., Gugerli, F., Landergott, U., Erhardt, A., Linder, H.P.,
 403 Holderegger, R. In press. Effects of floral neighborhood on seed set and degree of
 404 outbreeding in a high-alpine cushion plant. Oecologia.
 405 Zoller, H., Lenzin, H., Erhardt, A., 2002. Pollination and breeding system of *Eritrichium*
 406 *nanum* (Boraginaceae). Plant Syst. Evol. 233, 1-14.
 407

408 **Fig. 1.** Design of experimental plots. The solid circles indicate the outer rings (radius 1.5m)
409 that define plots, and the smaller dashed circles indicate the inner circles (radius 0.5m) that
410 received one of four different treatments. Black dots represent *Eritrichium nanum* and
411 crosses represent *Saxifraga* individuals. En: three *E. nanum*; En+En: 11 *E. nanum*; En+S:
412 three *E. nanum* with *Saxifraga* species; S+S: *Saxifraga* individuals only. Open dots
413 represent ten *E. nanum* cushions in the outer ring.

414
415 **Fig. 2.** Effects of treatments and weather conditions on the attractiveness of experimental
416 plots to insect visitors. (a) Percentages of 236 observation periods during which pollinators
417 were present (filled) or absent (open) per treatment. (b) Log mean number of insect visitors
418 ($\pm$ SE) per observation period and treatment, taken from averages of numbers of visitors
419 seen at the beginning and end of each period (excluding observation periods where no
420 visitors were observed). Different lower-case letters indicate significant differences between
421 treatments according to Bonferroni pairwise comparison ($\alpha \leq 0.05$). (c) Percentages of
422 observation periods during which pollinators were present (filled) or absent (open) as a
423 function of weather conditions (good = sunny and no wind; intermediate = cloudy and/or
424 weak wind; adverse = rainy and/or strong wind). (d) Total number of insect visitors of
425 different taxa per treatment across all observation periods (S: Syrphidae; D: other Diptera;
426 H: Hymenoptera; C: Coleoptera). Numbers within the histograms in (a) and (c) indicate the
427 numbers of observation periods. Numbers in (d) give the number of observed insect visitors.
428 For treatment abbreviations see Figure 1.

429

430 **Table 1.** Location of study sites in the Upper Engadine and adjacent valleys of southeastern
431 Switzerland as well as the number of plots established per treatment at each site. For
432 explanation of treatments see Figure 1.
433

Site	Name	Longitude/latitude (E/N)	En plots	En+En plots	En+S plots	S+S plots
1	Fuorcla d'Agnel	9°43'00" / 46°31'42"	2	2	2	2
2	Fallerfurgga	9°35'18" / 46°27'74"	1	1	1	1
3	Forcellina	9°36'75" / 46°25'61"	1	1	1	1
4	Margun	9°43'88" / 46°30'00"	3	3	3	3
5	Fuorcla Muragl	9°57'00" / 46°31'77"	1	1	1	1
6	Pischa	9°59'32" / 46°28'64"	3	3	3	3
7	Piz Nair	9°46'80" / 46°30'42"	4	4	4	4

1 **Table 2** Overview of statistically analyzed variables, data transformation, treatments (Fig. 1), statistical methods,
2 covariables and factors as well as P-values for those effects that are significant.

3

Data	Data type [transformation]	Treatments	Statistical method*	Covariable [transformation]	Factors	Interaction	Significant effects	Chi ²	F-value	P
Attractiveness of plots										
(a) Presence of visitors	0 or 1 per plot	En En + En En + S S + S	LR	Flowers per plot [log] Weather	Study site (random) Treatment (fixed) Time (fixed)		Treatment Study site Weather Total number of flowers	20.738 20.373 7.896 12.563		0.001 0.002 0.019 0.001
(b) Number of visitors	Average number of visitors per plot [log + 1]	En En + En En + S S + S	GLM	Flowers per plot [log] Weather	Study site (random) Treatment (fixed) Time (fixed)	Study site x treatment	Treatment Total number of flowers		6.464 _{3, 23.667} 4.059 _{1,81}	0.002 0.047
Behaviour of visitors										
(c) Percentage of En flowers visited	Number of En flowers visited over total number of En flowers [log + 1]	En En + En En + S	GLM	Weather	Study site (random) Treatment (fixed) Time (fixed)	Study site x treatment		-		-
(d) Percentage of S flowers visited	Number of S flowers visited over total number of S flowers [log + 1]	En + S S + S	GLM	Weather	Study site (random) Treatment (fixed) Time (fixed)	Study site x treatment	Weather Study site x treatment	5.252 _{1, 80} 3.788 _{6, 80}		0.025 0.002
(e) Number of En flowers visited	Mean number of visited En flowers per visitor [log + 1]	En En + En En + S	GLM	Number of En flowers per plot [log + 1] Number of S flowers per plot [log + 1] Weather	Study site (random) Treatment (fixed) Time (fixed)	Study site x treatment	Study site x treatment	2.778 _{8, 68}		0.010
(f) Number of S flowers visited	Mean number of visited S flowers per visitor [log + 1]	En + S S + S	GLM	Number of En flowers per plot [log + 1] Number of S flowers per plot [log + 1] Weather	Study site (random) Treatment (fixed) Time (fixed)	Study site x treatment	Number of S flowers per plot	6.076 _{1, 78}		0.016
(g) Geitonogamy of En cushions	Mean geitonogamous visits per visitor [log + 1]	En En + En En + S	GLM	Number of En flowers per plot [log + 1] Number of S flowers per plot [log + 1] Weather	Study site (random) Treatment (fixed) Time (fixed)	Study site x treatment	Study site x treatment	2.910 _{8, 68}		0.007
(h) Geitonogamy of S cushions	Mean geitonogamous visits per visitor [log + 1]	En + S S + S	GLM	Number of En flowers per plot [log + 1] Number of S flowers per plot [log + 1] Weather	Study site (random) Treatment (fixed) Time (fixed)	Study site x treatment	Study site	10.118 _{6, 5,642}		0.008

* LR: logistic regression; GLM: general linear model

Fig. 1

Fig. 2