





Journal of the Italian Society for Vegetation Science

Animal-mediated interactions for pollination in saltmarsh communities

E. Fantinato, G. Buffa

Department of Environmental Science, Informatics and Statistics, University Ca' Foscari of Venice, Via Torino 155, I-30172 Venice, Italy.

Edy Fantinato D https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0114-4738, Gabriella Buffa D https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0862-637X

Abstract

Among the wide variety of biotic interactions, animal-mediated pollination plays a crucial role in the maintenance of the integrity of plant communities. Thus, there is increasing concern about the possible effects that the growing loss of pollinators (i.e., pollinator crisis phenomenon) might have on plant communities. Recent studies revealed that pollination interactions often occur at the landscape scale, with plant species of different communities interacting through pollinator sharing. Saltmarshes provide a suitable example of plant communities spatially co-occurring at the landscape scale, with the micro-topography determining a precise zonation of ecologically distinct halophytic communities. However, little is still known about pollination interactions in saltmarshes. The aim of the present study was to assess which halophytic community contribute best to pollinator species richness in saltmarshes and whether plant species of different halophytic communities interact through pollinator sharing. To this aim we placed 20 permanent plots per plant community and monitored pollination interactions between plants and pollinators once a month during the overall flowering season. Our results revealed that animal-mediated pollination occurred in only two halophytic communities, with three species depending on animals for their pollination. When comparing halophytic communities in terms of richness of pollinator species, the vegetation of sandbanks, mudflats and sandflats emerged as the richest one. Animal-pollinated species of saltmarshes only partially shared pollinator species, of pollinators showed by animal-pollinated species of different halophytic communities. In conclusion, the high complementarity in the spectrum of pollinators showed by animal-pollinated species of different halophytic communities makes all halophytic communities hosting animal-pollinated species important for the conservation of pollinators.

Key words: Biodiversity conservation, biotic interactions, halophytic communities, landscape, pollinators, Venice lagoon.

Introduction

Among the wide variety of biotic interactions, animal-mediated pollination plays a crucial role in the maintenance of the integrity of plant communities (Fantinato *et al.*, 2019a). Nearly 4 out of 5 of both wild plants and crops depend on animal-pollination, often provided by wild, unmanaged, pollinator species (Klein *et al.*, 2007; Winfree, 2008). Moreover, in natural and semi-natural plant communities, pollinationrelated interactions remarkably contribute to shaping patterns of plant species distribution and co-occurrence (Pellisier *et al.*, 2010; Heystek & Pauw, 2014; Fantinato *et al.*, 2018a).

Given the importance of animal-mediated pollination for the integrity of plant communities, there is increasing concern about the growing loss of pollinator species (Potts *et al.*, 2010). According to the IPBES (2016), over 40% of invertebrate pollinators are at risk of extinction, mostly bees and butterflies. Pollinator decline is expected to limit not only wild plants reproduction, but also crop production, thereby threatening food security for humans and wildlife as well as global economic stability (Burkle *et al.*, 2013; Garibaldi *et al.*, 2013; Tylianakis, 2013). Although pollinator populations are affected by a range of factors, such as increasing use of agrochemicals, parasites and diseases, local and global environmental degradation and the loss of flowering plants in natural and semi-natural communities are ranked at the top of threatening factors in determining their decline (Kosior *et al.*, 2007).

During the last decades, the need to forecast the possible effects of pollinator decline on plant communities has stimulated studies to deepen our understanding of the role of animal-mediated pollination in assuring the integrity of natural and semi-natural communities. So far, the focus has been on a few communities outstanding for their high species richness (Koski et al., 2015; Hicks et al., 2016; Fantinato et al., 2018a; Fantinato, 2019). Among temperate communities, species-rich grassland communities have been the subject of considerable attention. Indeed, they host a high diversity of animal-pollinated species (Fantinato et al., 2016a, b; 2017; 2019b; Slaviero et al., 2016), which can provide floral resources (i.e., nectar and pollen) to pollinators, thus effectively promoting their conservation (Fantinato et al., 2019c). However, pollination interactions in species-poor communities have been largely overlooked and our understanding of their contribution to pollinator conservation is still lacking.

Corresponding author: Edy Fantinato. Department of Environmental Science, Informatics and Statistics, University Ca'Foscari of Venice, Via Torino 155, I-30172 Venice, Italy; e-mail: edy.fantinato@unive.it

Very recently pollination studies have shifted the focus from single plant communities to the landscape scale (Fantinato et al., 2018b; Betts et al., 2019; Hackett et al., 2019). Landscape structure and composition influences the richness and abundance of pollinator populations, with diverse and complementary natural and semi-natural plant communities providing diverse and complementary sets of resources (Potts et al., 2010). In complex landscapes, different plant communities with different structure and composition, and different vegetative and flowering phenology provide for higher and more stable availability of nectar and pollen resources, as well as overwintering refuges (Betts et al., 2019). This is particularly true when different plant communities are deeply interconnected at the landscape scale through flows of energy and materials, naturally forming continuous patterns in response to environmental gradients (e.g., coastal plant communities, river and lake edges; Fantinato et al., 2018b).

Marine-coastal ecosystems provide a particularly suitable example of plant communities spatially cooccurring at the landscape scale (Silan et al., 2017; Del Vecchio et al., 2018; 2019; Ivajnšič et al., 2018). Among coastal ecosystems, saltmarshes are a major, widespread habitat in temperate zones and are characterized by high primary productivity and species diversity, representing habitat for migratory waterfowl, transient fish species and indigenous flora and fauna. Salt marshes typically occupy the upper intertidal zone, between land and open salt or brackish water (Allen & Pye, 1992; Adam, 2002). Within the Mediterranean region, they reach their greatest extent along the low-energy Northern Adriatic coastal area, which includes the Venice lagoon and the Po River Delta, characterized by the presence of lagoons, marshes and reclaimed lands. Although not particularly variable, the micro-topography, i.e. the small elevation gradients, induces a non-random, spatially correlated distribution of halophytic vegetation (Pignatti, 1966; Chapman, 1976) selecting plant species according to their tolerance to environmental factors like flooding periods, soil salinity and root oxygen availability. These factors ultimately determine a precise zonation of ecologically distinct halophytic communities (Chapman, 1976; Marani et al., 2004; Ivajnšič et al., 2018).

Saltmarshes occupy a critical interface between the land and the sea, where they provide important ecological and economic services, such as nutrient removal, storm protection, carbon sequestration, and habitats for numerous species of highly habitat specialized plants, fish, birds and invertebrates (Deegan *et al.*, 2012). Moreover, fringing many of the most anthropized soft coasts, saltmarshes often represent the dominant natural component in the mosaic of agricultural, urbanized and natural areas typical of marine-coastal landscapes (Del Vecchio *et al.*, 2016; Perillo *et al.*, 2019). In light of these considerations, in the present study we assessed pollination interactions in saltmarshes considering all halophytic communities co-occurring at the landscape scale. Specifically, we addressed the issue by answering the following questions: (i) are there halophytic communities that contribute best to pollinator species richness in saltmarshes? (ii) Do plant species of different halophytic communities interact through pollinator sharing?

Material and methods

Study site

The study took place in the Venice lagoon which occupies an area of approximately 500 km² (mean depth 1.1 m, tidal range 0.6–1 m), with saltmarshes being mostly located in the SW and NE parts (Day *et al.*, 1998). Overall, saltmarshes occupy an area of nearly 4,000 ha, and are deeply interconnected with agricultural areas (mostly orchards; Buffa & Ghirelli, 2017). Specifically, data were collected in the Campalto saltmarshes (45°28'47"N; 12°18'07"E; Fig. 1), a well conserved example of saltmarshes (Francalanci *et al.*, 2013) extending for 16 ha in the northern portion of the Venice lagoon.

Halophytic communities of saltmarshes are generally characterized by a low richness of plant species showing a high habitat specialization, most of which are wind-pollinated graminoids (Ghirelli *et al.*, 2007). Given their importance for biodiversity conservation, halophytic communities are listed in Annex I of the EU Habitat Directive (92/43/EEC; Gigante *et al.*, 2018). According to Ivajnšič *et al.* (2018) at Campalto, proceeding from the lowest to the highest level along



Fig. 1 - Map of the study site. Data were collected in the Campalto saltmarshes.

the marsh's elevation gradient, the typical transect of halophytic communities includes (i) the perennial saline rush marsh vegetation subjected to prolonged flooding regime, (ii) the vegetation of the sandbanks, mudflats and sandflats, (iii) the pioneer, irregularly flooded stands of annual succulent halophytes, (iv) the perennial saltmarsh vegetation dominated by succulent dwarf shrubs, and (v) the meso-eutrophic brackish swamp reeds (Tab. 1).

Data collection

We identified halophytic communities and their spatial extent based on Ivajnšič *et al.* (2018). Based on a preliminary survey, animal-pollinated species only occurred in two halophytic communities: (i) the vegetation of sandbanks, mudflats and sandflats and (ii) the perennial saltmarsh vegetation dominated by succulent dwarf shrubs. All other halophytic communities hosted almost no animal-pollinated species.

At the beginning of the season we randomly placed 20 permanent plots $(1 \text{ m} \times 1 \text{ m})$ in each of the two halophytic communities, for a total of 40 plots. In each plot, the presence of animal-pollinated species was recorded, and their flowering phenology was monitored every fifteen days, from the beginning (01-08-2017) to the end of the flowering season (01-10-2017), for a total of five surveys. Flowering monitoring started at the opening of the first flower and ended when individual plants no longer possessed any flower with anthers (Fantinato et al. 2016a). Moreover, once a month (12-08-2017; 11-09-2017; 15-10-2017) we recorded the total coverage of visual displays per species and the visiting pollinators by counting the number of visits to each plant species. Depending on the species, a visual display consisted of a single flower, an inflorescence or a group of flowers occurring together in a recognisable visual unit (Hegland & Totland, 2005). Each plot

was monitored for 10 minutes (from 10 a.m. to 4 p.m.) in warm and sunny days, for a total of 1,200 minutes. Both plants and pollinators were identified at the level of species or morphospecies.

Data analysis

To estimate the overall species richness of pollinators in the targeted halophytic communities, we built plotbased rarefaction curves (Gotelli & Colwell, 2001). Specifically, we pooled data recorded in each plot during the three surveys. We computed the accumulation curves using the cumulative number of plots sampled per halophytic community. Moreover, since we sampled halophytic communities subjected to different environmental conditions, which might possibly lead to differences in pollinator activity, for each halophytic community we evaluated the sampling completeness of pollinator species by using the Chao 2 estimator of asymptotic species richness (Colwell et al., 2004). We chose Chao 2 estimator because it is one of the least biased estimates for a small number of samples (Chao et al., 2009; Chacoff et al., 2012). Pollinator species richness was calculated by quantifying the percentage of the asymptotic richness detected by the observed one. The accumulation curves and the Chao 2 estimator were calculated with the R-based package Vegan (Oksanen et al., 2013).

To test whether plant species of different halophytic communities interact through pollinator sharing we compared each plant species spectrum of pollinators through one-way PERMANOVA applying the Bray-Curtis similarity index with 9,999 randomizations (Anderson & Ter Braak, 2003), using contacts recorded in each plot as replicates. No significant differences would reveal pollinator sharing between plant species. All calculations were done within the R statistical framework (R Development Core Team 2012).

Tab. 1 - List of plant communities occurring in the Campalto saltmarshes. For each plant community we reported the correspondent phytosociological association, the list of dominant plant species, the mean elevation (\pm SD) on the average sea level according to Ivajnšič *et al.* (2018), and the correspondent Nature 2000 habitat.

Plant community	Phytosociological association	Dominant species	Mean elevation (m) ± SD (m)	Natura 2000 habitat
Perennial saline rush marsh vegetation subjected to prolonged flooding regime	Puccinellio festuciformis - Juncetum maritimi (Pignatti 1953) Géhu et Scoppola in Gèhu et al. 1984	Juncus maritimus Lam., Puccinellia festuciformis (Host) Parl.	0.26 ± 0.09	1410
Vegetation of sandbanks, mudflats and sandflats	Limonio narbonensis- Puccinellietum palustris (Pignatti 1966) Géhu et Scoppola in Géhu et al. 1984	Limonium narbonense Mill., Sporobolus maritimus (Curtis) P.M. Peterson & Saarela	0.30 ± 0.05	1320
Pioneer, irregularly flooded stands of annual succulent halophytes	<i>Salicornietum venetae</i> Pignatti 1966	Salicornia veneta Pignatti & Lausi	0.31 ± 0.07	1310
Perennial salt-marsh vegetation dominated by succulent dwarf shrubs	Puccinellio festuciformis - Artrocnemetum fruticosae (Br Bl. 1928) Géhu 1976	Salicornia fruticosa (L.) L., Puccinellia festuciformis (Host) Parl.	0.37 ± 0.08	1420
Meso-eutrophic brackish swamp reeds	Aggr. <i>Thinopyrum acutum</i> (DC.) Banfi; Aggr. <i>Phragmites australis</i> (Cav.) Trin. ex Steud.	Thinopyrum acutum (DC.) Banfi, Phragmites australis (Cav.) Trin. ex Steud.	0.49 ± 0.08	-

Results

In the study site we identified three animal-pollinated species. Specifically, we recorded two animal-pollinated species in the vegetation of sandbanks, mudflats and sandflats, while one in the perennial saltmarsh vegetation dominated by succulent dwarf shrubs (Tab. 2). Limonium narbonense and Limbarda chritmoides flowered for almost 5 decades and showed synchronous flowering periods (from 01-08-2017 to 15-09-2017). On the other hand, Galatella pannonica flowered for almost eight decades and its flowering period overlapped with those of Limonium narbonense and Limbarda chritmoides for only 3 decades (from 15-08-2017 to 31-10-2017). However, though only three animal-pollinated species could be observed in saltmarshes, the coverage of their visual displays during the peak of flowering was relatively high, with inflorescences of Limonium narbonense covering $50.00\% \pm$ 26.00% (mean \pm SD), those of Limbarda chritmoides $4.45\% \pm 3.53\%$ and those of G. pannonica $10.55\% \pm$ 8.53% of the plot surface.

Overall, we recorded 222 pollination contacts between the three plant species and nine pollinator species (Tab. 2). Pollinator species belonged to three orders, i.e., Diptera (five species), Hymenoptera (two species), and Lepidoptera (two species). The most visited plant species was Limonium narbonense (146 contacts with six pollinator species), followed by G. pannonica (45 contacts with seven pollinator species) and Limbarda chritmoides (31 contacts with three pollinator species). Sampling completeness revealed that we detected the 100% of pollinator species in both the vegetation of sandbanks, mudflats and sandflats, and the perennial saltmarsh vegetation dominated by succulent dwarf shrubs. Overall, the richness of pollinator species was higher in the vegetation of sandbanks, mudflats and sandflats (9 pollinator species), than in the perennial saltmarsh vegetation dominated by succulent dwarf shrubs (3 pollinator species; Fig. 2).

Animal-pollinated species of saltmarshes only partially shared pollinator species, with significant differences revealed by the PERMANOVA (F = 8.118; P = 0.001; d.f. = 1). In other words, the two different halophytic communities are not interconnected through pollination interactions. *Apis mellifera* L. (1758) was so far the most frequent pollinator of *Limonium narbonense* (Tab. 2; Fig. 3); while *Simuliidae* sp. 1 of *Limbarda chritmoides* (Tab. 2; Fig. 3). On the other hand, *G. pannonica* got into contact with a wider variety of pollinators than the first two plant species, and no markedly dominant pollinator species could be observed (Tab. 2; Fig. 3).

Discussion

Overall, in the saltmarshes of the Venice lagoon we observed only three species depending on animals for their pollination. Despite the relative low number of plant species pollinated by animals, animal-mediated pollination should not be considered secondary among biotic interactions in saltmarshes. Indeed, *Limonium narbonense*, *Limbarda chritmoides* and *Galatella pannonica* are especially widespread in the Venice lagoon (Marani *et al.*, 2006; Rizzetto and Tosi, 2012), possibly contributing to local pollinator conservation.

There is general agreement that the richness of plant species positively influences the richness of pollinator species (Holzschuh *et al.*, 2007; Sárospataki *et al.*, 2009), which has been explained by the increase of floral resource heterogeneity (nectar and pollen) and quantity, which increases the attractiveness for many pollinator species seeking single and multiple resources (Ghazoul, 2006). This, in turn, has led pollinator conservation programs to focus mostly on species rich plant communities. However, Fantinato *et al.* (2018a) showed that in coastal dune ecosystems, richness of animal-pollinated plants and pollinators may not be necessarily correlated, with few plant species sustaining the majority of pollinator species.

Tab. 2 - List of animal-pollinated species recorded in the Campalto saltmarshes. For each animal-pollinated species we reported its plant community, the flowering period, the inflorescence coverage in the plots (mean \pm SD) during the peak of flowering, and the list of visiting pollinators.

Animal-pollinated species	Plant community	Flowering period	Inflorescence coverage (%;		Total number
			mean ± SD) at the	visiting poinnators	of
			peak of flowering		contacts
Limonium narbonense Mill.	Vegetation of sandbanks, mudflats and sandflats	from 01-08-2017 to15-09-2017	$50.00\% \pm 26.00\%$	Apis mellifera (L., 1758), Bombus terrestris (L., 1758), Odontomyia angulata (Panzer, 1798), Sphaerophoria scripta (L., 1758), Pontia edusa (Fabricius, 1777), Vanessa cardui (L., 1758)	146
Limbarda chritmoides (L.) Dumort	Perennial salt-marsh vegetation dominated by succulent dwarf shrubs	from 01-08-2017 to15-09-2017	$4.45\% \pm 3.53\%$	Apis mellifera (L., 1758), Sphaerophoria scripta (L., 1758), Simuliidae sp. 1	31
Galatella pannonica (Jacq.) Galasso, Bartolucci & Ardenghi	Vegetation of sandbanks, mudflats and sandflats	from 15-08-2017 to 31-10-2017	$10.55\% \pm 8.53\%$	Apis mellifera (L., 1758), Eristalinus aeneus (Scopoli, 1763), Eristalis pertinax (Scopoli, 1763), Sphaerophoria scripta (L., 1758), Simuliidae sp. 1, Pontia edusa (Fabricius, 1777), Vanessa cardui (L., 1758)	45



Fig. 2 - Accumulation curves of the richness of pollinators. Accumulation curves were computed by using the cumulative number of plots sampled per plant community as the unit of sampling effort. Plant communities were represented by different colours; black continuous line: the vegetation of sandbanks, mudflats and sandflats, grey dashed line: the perennial saltmarsh vegetation dominated by succulent dwarf shrubs.

Our results revealed that, such as in coastal dunes, also in saltmarshes a few animal-pollinated species are responsible for the maintenance of the pollinator community. Indeed, though we recorded only three animalpollinated species, we showed that mass flowering can provide abundant resources to pollinators, possibly contributing to their conservation. Species of genus Limonium have been proved to be important sources of nectar for many pollinator species (Sei & Porter, 2006; Zhang et al., 2015). Similarly, species belonging to the family of Asteraceae, e.g. Limbarda chritmoides and G. pannonica, are pollen and nectar rewarding, and they generally receive many kinds of pollinators (Willmer, 2011). Moreover, the relatively late flowering season of the three species, which is markedly centred at late summer - early autumn, guarantees floral resources for pollinators also during a period of the year in which flowering events are almost completed in the majority of plant communities (e.g., Fantinato et al., 2016a, 2018b).

When comparing halophytic communities in terms of richness of pollinator species, the vegetation of sandbanks, mudflats and sandflats emerged as the richest one. The presence of two attractive animal-pollinated species with poorly overlapping flowering periods (i.e., *Limonium narbonense* and *G. pannonica*) makes floral resources to pollinators available for a longer flowering season than in the perennial saltmarsh vegetation dominated by succulent dwarf shrubs. However, it is worth to consider that *Limbarda chritmoides*, while being poorly visited, showed an almost comple-



Fig. 3 - Abundance of pollinator species for the three animalpollinated species recorded in saltmarshes.

mentary spectrum of pollinators with the co-flowering species *Limonium narbonense*, thus playing an important role for the maintenance of at least a portion of the pollinator community of saltmarshes.

From an ecological point of view, co-flowering species are likely to experience strong competition for pollinators and potentially suffer high pollen loss and fitness decrease (Fang & Huang, 2013; Van der Kooi *et al.*, 2016). Adaptations to minimize competition and pollen loss may include specialization on different pollinators or disjointed flowering periods (Muchhala *et al.*, 2010; Kipling & Warren, 2014; Ruchisansakun *et al.*, 2016), which can ultimately allow animal-pollinated species to spatially co-occur (Fantinato *et al.*, 2018a).

Conclusion

Our study proved that, when different plant communities are spatially co-occurring, the assessment of pollination interactions at the landscape scale results in a better understanding of their contribution to pollinator conservation. While being overlooked in pollination studies, the overall late flowering season and the high local abundance of animal-pollinated species in the halophytic communities of saltmarshes, make them an important component of the landscape for the pollinator conservation purpose. Being characteristic of a diversified landscape, in which natural and agricultural areas coexist, halophytic communities of saltmarshes can crucially contribute to the pollination service retention by providing a foraging habitat for pollinators. Further development of the present study should improve the comprehension of pollination interactions by including the more inland plant communities. This would reveal possible pollinator exchanges between the plain and the lagoon, ultimately providing important information for the definition of a systemic plan for the conservation of pollinators.

References

- Adam P., 2002. Saltmarshes in a time of change. Environmental Conservation 29: 39-61.
- Allen J.R.L. & Pye K., 1992. Saltmarshes: Morphodynamics, Conservation, and Engineering Significance. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Anderson M.J. & Ter Braak C.J.F., 2003. Permutation tests for multi-factorial analysis of variance. Journal of Statistical Computation and Simulation 73: 85-113.
- Betts M.G., Hadley A.S. & Kormann U., 2019. The landscape ecology of pollination. Landscape Ecology 34: 961-966.
- Buffa G. & Ghirelli L., 2017. La laguna di Venezia. In Blasi C., Biondi E. (Eds.), La fora in Italia: 180-184.
 Ministero dell'Ambiente e della Tutela del Territorio e del Mare, Sapienza Università Editrice, Roma.
- Burkle L.A., Marlin L.C. & Knight T.M., 2013. Plant-Pollinator Interactions over 120 Years: Loss of Species, Co-Occurrence, and Function. Science 339: 1611-1615.
- Chacoff N.P., Vázquez D.P., Lomáscolo S.B., Stevani E.L., Dorado J. & Padrón B. 2012. Evaluating sampling completeness in a desert plant-pollinator network. Journal of Animal Ecology 81: 190-200.
- Chao A., Colwell R.K., Lin C.-W. & Gotelli N.J., 2009. Sufficient sampling for asymptotic minimum species richness estimators. Ecology 90: 1125-1133.
- Chapman V.J., 1976. Coastal vegetation (2nd ed.). Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Colwell R.K., Chang X.M. & Chang J., 2004. Interpolating, extrapolating, and comparing incidencebased species accumulation curves. Ecology 85: 2717-2727.
- Deegan L.A., Johnson D.S., Warren R.S., Peterson B.J, Fleeger J.W., Fagherazzi S. & Wollheim W.M., 2012. Coastal eutrophication as a driver of salt marsh loss. Nature 490: 388-392.
- Del Vecchio S., Fantinato E., Janssen J.A.M., Bioret F., Acosta A., Prisco I., Tzonev R., Marcenò C., Rodwell J. & Buffa, G., 2018. Biogeographic variability of coastal perennial grasslands at the European scale. Applied Vegetation Science 21: 312-321.
- Del Vecchio S., Fantinato E., Silan G. & Buffa G., 2019. Trade-offs between sampling effort and data quality in habitat monitoring. Biodiversity and Conservation 28: 55-73.
- Del Vecchio S., Slaviero A., Fantinato E. & Buffa G., 2016. The use of plant community attributes to detect habitat quality in coastal environments. AoB Plants 8: plw040.
- Fang Q. & Huang S.Q., 2013. A directed network analysis of heterospecific pollen transfer in a biodiverse community. Ecology 94: 1176-1185.
- Fantinato E., Giovanetti M., Del Vecchio S. & Buffa G., 2016a. Altitudinal patterns of floral morpholo-

gies in dry calcareous grasslands. Plant Sociology 53: 83-90.

- Fantinato E., Del Vecchio S., Slaviero A.S., Conti L., Acosta A.T.R. & Buffa G., 2016b. Does flowering synchrony contribute to the sustainment of dry grassland biodiversity? Flora: Morphology, Distribution, Functional Ecology of Plants 222: 96-103.
- Fantinato E., Del Vecchio S., Baltieri M., Fabris B. & Buffa G., 2017. Are food-deceptive orchid species really functionally specialized for pollinators? Ecological Research 32: 951-959.
- Fantinato E., 2019. The impact of (mass) tourism on coastal dune pollination networks. Biological Conservation 236: 70-78.
- Fantinato E., Del Vecchio S., Giovanetti M., Acosta A.T.R. & Buffa, G., 2018a. New insights into plants coexistence in species-rich communities: the pollination interaction perspective. Journal of Vegetation Science 29: 6-14.
- Fantinato E., Del Vecchio S., Silan G. & Buffa G., 2018b. Pollination networks along the sea-inland gradient reveal landscape patterns of keystone plant species. Scientific Reports 8: 1-9.
- Fantinato E., Del Vecchio S., Gaetan C. & Buffa G, 2019a. The resilience of pollination interactions: importance of temporal phases. Journal of Plant Ecology 12: 157-162.
- Fantinato E., Sonkoly J., Silan G., Valkó O., Tóthmérész B., Deák B., Kelemen A., Miglécz T., Del Vecchio S., Bettiol F., Buffa G. & Török P. 2019b. Pollination and dispersal trait spectra recover faster than growth form spectrum during the spontaneous succession in sandy old-fields. Applied Vegetation Science 22: 435-443.
- Fantinato E., Del Vecchio S. & Buffa G., 2019c. The co-occurrence of different grassland communities increases the stability of pollination networks. Flora: Morphology, Distribution, Ecology of Plants 255: 11-17.
- Francalanci S., Bendoni M., Rinaldi M. & Solari L., 2013. Ecomorphodynamic evolution of salt marshes: Experimental observations of bank retreat processes. Geomorphology 195: 53-65.
- Garibaldi L.A., Steffan-Dewenter I., Winfree R., Aizen M.A., Bommarco R., Cunningham S.A., *et al.*, 2013. Wild pollinators enhance fruit set of crops regardless of honey bee abundance. Science 339: 1608-1611.
- Ghazoul J., 2006. Floral diversity and the facilitation of pollination. Journal of Ecology 94: 295-304.
- Ghirelli L., Scarton F., Mion D., Cavalli I., & Cazzin M., 2007. Cartografia della vegetazione emersa (barene e canneti) della Laguna di Venezia: Prima Fase. Lavori Societa Veneziana di Scienze Naturali 32: 7-14.
- Gigante D., Acosta A.T.R., Agrillo E., Armiraglio S., Assini S., Attorre F., Bagella S., Buffa G., Casella L., Giancola C., Giusso del Galdo G.P., Marcenò C.,

Pezzi G., Prisco I., Venanzoni R. & Viciani D., 2018. Habitat conservation in Italy: the state of the art in the light of the first European Red List of Terrestrial and Freshwater Habitats. Rendiconti Lincei-Scienze Fisiche e Naturali 29: 251-265.

- Gotelli N.J. & Colwell R.K., 2001. Quantifying biodiversity: procedures and pitfalls in the measurement and comparison of species richness. Ecology Letters 4: 379-391.
- Hackett T.D., Sauve A.M.C., Davies N., Montoya D., Tylianakis J.M. & Memmott J., 2019. Reshaping our understanding of species' roles in landscape-scale networks. Ecology Letters 22: 1367-1377.
- Hegland S.J. & Totland Ø., 2005. Relationships between species' floral traits and pollinator visitation in a temperate grassland. Oecologia 145: 586-594.
- Heystek A. & Pauw A., 2014. Does competition for pollinators contribute to structuring Erica communities? Journal of Vegetation Science 25: 648-656.
- Hicks D.M., Ouvrard P., Baldock K.C.R., Baude M., Goddard M.A., *et al.*, 2016. Food for pollinators: quantifying the nectar and pollen resources of urban flower meadows. PLOS ONE 11: e0158117.
- Holzschuh A., Steffan-Dewenter I., Kleijn D. & Tscharntke T., 2007. Diversity of flower-visiting bees in cereal fields: effects of farming system, landscape composition and regional context. Journal of Applied Ecology 44: 41-49.
- IPBES, 2016. Summary for policymakers of the assessment report of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services on pollinators, pollination and food production. Potts S.G., Imperatriz-Fonseca V.L., Ngo H.T., Biesmeijer J.C., Breeze T.D., Dicks L.V., Garibaldi L.A., Hill R., Settele J., Vanbergen A.J., Aizen M.A., Cunningham S.A., Eardley C., Freitas B.M., Gallai N., Kevan P.G., Kovács-Hostyánszki A., Kwapong P.K., Li J., Li X., Martins D.J., Nates-Parra G., Pettis J.S., Rader R. & Viana B.F. (Eds.). Secretariat of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services, Bonn, Germany.
- Ivajnšič D., Kaligaric M., Fantinato E., Del Vecchio S. & Buffa G., 2018. The fate of coastal habitats in the Venice Lagoon from the sea level rise perspective. Applied Geography 98: 34-42.
- Kipling R.P. & Warren J., 2014. How generalists coexist: The role of floral phenotype and spatial factors in the pollination systems of two *Ranunculus* species. Journal of Plant Ecology 7: 480-489.
- Klein A.-M., Vaissière B.E., Cane J.H., Steffan-Dewenter I., Cunningham S.A., Kremen C. & Tscharntke T., 2007. Importance of pollinators in changing landscapes for world crops. Proceedings of the Royal Society of London Series B – Biological Sciences 274: 303-313.
- Kosior A., Celary W., Olejniczak P., Fijał J., Król W.,

Solarz W. & Płonka P., 2007. The decline of the bumble bees and cuckoo bees (*Hymenoptera: api-dae: bombini*) of Western and Central Europe. Oryx 41: 79-88.

- Koski M.H., Meindl G.A., Arceo-Gomez G., Wolowoski M., LeCroy K.A. & Ashman T.L., 2015. Plant– flower visitor networks in a serpentine metacommunity: assessing traits associated with keystone plant species. Arthropod-Plant Interactions 9: 9-21.
- Marani M., Belluco E., Ferrari S., Silvestri S., D'Alpaos A., Lanzoni S., Feola A. & Rinaldo A., 2006. Analysis, synthesis and modelling of high-resolution observations of salt-marsh eco-geomorphological patterns in the Venice lagoon. Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science 69: 414-426.
- Marani M., Lanzoni S., Silvestri S. & Rinaldo A., 2004. Tidal landforms, patterns of halophytic vegetation and the fate of the lagoon of Venice. Journal of Marine Systems 51: 191-210.
- Muchhala N., Brown Z., Armbruster W.S. & Potts M.D., 2010. Competition drives specialization in pollination systems through costs to male fitness. The American Naturalist 176: 732-743.
- Oksanen J., Blanchet F.G., Kindt R., Legendre P., Minchin P.R., O'Hara R.B., Simpson G.L., Solymos P., Stevens M.H.H. & Wagner H. 2013. Vegan: community ecology package. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna.
- Pellissier L., Pottier J., Vittoz P., Dubuis A. & Guisan A., 2010. Spatial pattern of floral morphology: possible insight into the effects of pollinators on plant distributions. Oikos 119: 1805-1813.
- Perillo G., Wolanski E., Cahoon D. & Hopkinson C., 2019. Coastal Wetlands. Elsevier. ISBN 978-0-444-53103-2. xxxi + 941 pp.
- Pignatti S., 1966. La vegetazione alofila della laguna veneta, Istituto Veneto di Scienze, Lettere ed Arti, Memorie, vol. XXXIII Fascicolo I, Venezia.
- Potts S.G., Biesmeijer J.C., Kremen C., Neumann P., Schweiger O. & Kunin, W.E., 2010. Global pollinator declines: trends, impacts and drivers. Trends in Ecology and Evolution 25: 345-353.
- R Development Core Team, 2012. R: a Language and Environment for Statistical Computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna.
- Rizzetto F. & Tosi L., 2012. Rapid response of tidal channel networks to sea-level variations (Venice Lagoon, Italy). Global and Planetary Change 92: 191-197.
- Ruchisansakun S., Tangtorwongsakul P., Cozien R.J., Smets E.F. & van der Niet T., 2016. Floral specialization for different pollinators and divergent use of the same pollinator among co-occurring *Impatiens* species (*Balsaminaceae*) from Southeast Asia. Botanical Journal of the Linnean Society 181: 651-666.
- Sárospataki, M., Báldi A., Batáry P., Józan Z., Erdos S. & Rédei T., 2009. Factors affecting the structure

of bee assemblages in extensively and intensively grazed grasslands in Hungary. Community Ecology 10: 182-188.

- Sei M. & Porter A.H., 2003. Microhabitat-specific early-larval survival of the maritime ringlet (*Coe-nonympha tullia nipisiquit*). Animal Conservation 6: 55-61.
- Silan G., Del Vecchio S., Fantinato E. & Buffa G., 2017. Habitat quality assessment through a multi-faceted approach: The case of the habitat 2130^{*} in Italy. Plant Sociology 54: 13-22.
- Slaviero A., Del Vecchio S., Pierce S., Fantinato E. & Buffa G., 2016. Plant community attributes affect dry grassland orchid establishment. Plant Ecology 217: 1533-1543.
- Tylianakis J.M., 2013. The Global Plight of Pollina-

tors. Science 339: 1532-1533.

- Van der Kooi C.J., Pen I., Staal M., Stavenga D.G., & Elzenga J.T.M., 2016. Competition for pollinators and intra-communal spectral dissimilarity of flowers. Plant Biology 18: 56-62
- Willmer P., 2011. Pollination and floral ecology. Princeton University Press.
- Winfree R., Williams N.M., Gaines H., Ascher J.S. & Kremen C., 2008. Wild bee pollinators provide the majority of crop visitation across land-use gradients in New Jersey and Pennsylvania, USA. Journal of Applied Ecology 45: 794-803.
- Zhang A.-Q., He S., Zhai Y.-X. & Huang S.-Q., 2015. Does persistence of showy calyces in *Limonium leptolobum* enhance pollinator attraction? Journal of Plant Ecology 8: 182-186.