

This is a repository copy of *Insect elevational specialization in a tropical biodiversity hotspot*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:

<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/id/eprint/122465/>

Version: Accepted Version

Article:

Macedo, Margarete V, Monteiro, Ricardo F, Flinte, Vivian et al. (10 more authors) (2017) Insect elevational specialization in a tropical biodiversity hotspot. *Insect conservation and diversity*. ISSN: 1752-458X


<https://doi.org/10.1111/icad.12267>

Reuse

Items deposited in White Rose Research Online are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved unless indicated otherwise. They may be downloaded and/or printed for private study, or other acts as permitted by national copyright laws. The publisher or other rights holders may allow further reproduction and re-use of the full text version. This is indicated by the licence information on the White Rose Research Online record for the item.

Takedown

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.

**Insect elevational specialization in a tropical biodiversity hotspot**

Journal:	<i>Insect Conservation and Diversity</i>
Manuscript ID	ICDIV-17-0097.R1
Manuscript Type:	Original Article
Date Submitted by the Author:	n/a
Complete List of Authors:	Macedo, Margarete; Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro, Departamento de Ecologia Monteiro, Ricardo; Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro, Departamento de Ecologia Flinte, Vivian; Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro, Departamento de Ecologia Almeida-Neto, Mário; Universidade Federal de Goiás, Departamento de Ecologia Khattar, Gabriel; Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro, Departamento de Ecologia da Silveira, Luiz; Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro, Departamento de Ecologia ARAUJO, CRISTINA; Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro, Departamento de Ecologia Araújo, Rodrigo; Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro, Departamento de Ecologia Colares, Carolina; Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro, Departamento de Ecologia Gomes, Carlos; Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro, Departamento de Ecologia Mendes, Clarice; Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro, Departamento de Ecologia dos Santos, Eduardo; Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro, Departamento de Ecologia Mayhew, Peter; University of York, Department of Biology
Keywords:	altitudinal ranges, climate change, elevational specialization, extinction risk, range shifting, tropical insects, tropical rainforest

1
2
3
4 SCHOLARONE™
5 Manuscripts
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For Review Only

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Insect elevational specialization in a tropical biodiversity hotspot

6
7 Running title: Tropical elevational specialization
8
9

10 Margarete V. Macedo¹, Ricardo F. Monteiro¹, Vivian Flinte¹,
11 Mario Almeida-Neto², Gabriel Khattar¹, Luiz F. L. da Silveira¹,
12 Cristina de O. Araújo¹, Rodrigo de O. Araújo¹, Carolina Colares¹,
13 Carlos V. da S. Gomes¹, Clarice B. Mendes¹, Eduardo F. Santos¹
14 and Peter J. Mayhew³

15
16 ¹ Departamento de Ecologia, Instituto de Biologia, Universidade Federal do Rio de
17 Janeiro, CEP 21941-590, RJ, Brazil

18 ² Departamento de Ecologia, Instituto de Ciências Biológicas, Universidade Federal de
19 Goiás, Goiânia, GO, Brazil.

20 ³ Department of Biology, University of York, Heslington, York, YO10 5DD, UK.

21 Correspondence to:

22 PJM

23 Tel: +44 (0) 1904 328644

24 Fax: +44 (0) 1904 328505

25 e-mail: peter.mayhew@york.ac.uk

1
2
3 26 **Abstract**
4
5
6
7
8
910
11 27 1. Tropical montane organisms are vulnerable to climate change because of elevational
12 specialization, but little is known of the variability of elevational specialization across
13 tropical insects.
14
1516
17 30 2. We assessed elevational specialization across several insect taxa comprising four
18 trophic groups 80-2263m up **an elevational transect** in Brazilian Atlantic Rainforest,
19 using community-based and species-based approaches.
20
2122
23 33 3. We sampled 697 species, of which 32% were found only in the top and 45% only in
24 the bottom half of **the transect**. Considering only the 182 species with at least five
25 individuals recorded, the percentage of species found exclusively in the top or bottom
26 half drops to 16% and 24%.
27
2829
30 37 4. Across four vegetation belts (lower montane forest, montane forest, upper montane
31 forest and Campos de Altitude) the Eumolpinae (herbivores) were more specialized than
32 Scarabaeinae (saprotrophs), or Lampyridae (predators). This result was robust to the
33 treatment of rare species, and the difference was most marked at higher elevations.
34 Lampyridae lacked upper montane forest specialists.
35
3637
38 42 5. Using all species sampled, specialization to the upper or lower half of **the transect**
39 was greatest amongst Chrysomelidae, Curculionidae (both herbivores) and Lampyridae,
40 and lowest amongst Tiphidae (parasitoids) and Coccinellidae (predators). However,
41 considering only better sampled species, Lampyridae were the most specialized and
42 Braconidae the least specialized. Trophic groups also varied in line with these findings.
43
4445
46 47 6. Our findings suggest high elevational specialization and concomitant extinction risk
47 in Brazilian Atlantic Rainforest insects. Differences in elevational specialization
48 between taxonomic groups may alter the functioning of insect communities under
49 climate change.
50
5152
53 52 Key words: altitudinal ranges, climate change, elevational specialization, extinction
54 risk, range shifting, tropical insects, tropical rainforest
55
5657
58 54
59
60

55 Introduction

56 Climate change is now widely recognized to be a major cause of extinction risk globally
57 (Thomas *et al.*, 2004; Parmesan, 2006; Brierley & Kingsford, 2009; Hannah, 2012;
58 Urban, 2015). One of the mechanisms by which changing climates might cause
59 extinction is when rising temperatures exceed critical physiological thresholds, forcing
60 species to shift their ranges to suitable habitats or leading them to extinction (Parmesan
61 & Yohe, 2003; Thomas *et al.*, 2004; Urban, 2015). The ability of a species to persist in
62 a wide range of thermal conditions is therefore likely to make it more resistant to
63 climate change, whilst species that can only persist in a narrow range of thermal
64 conditions will be more vulnerable (Deutsch *et al.*, 2008; Huey *et al.*, 2012).

65 Tropical species are generally regarded to have low thermal tolerance due to the
66 low seasonal temperature variability experienced, making them potentially vulnerable to
67 extinction from climate change (Addo-Bediako *et al.*, 2000, Deutsch *et al.*, 2008,
68 Bonebrake & Deutsch, 2012). The elevational ranges displayed by species may, at least
69 partially, indicate their thermal tolerances (McCain, 2009; Laurance *et al.*, 2011;
70 Garcia-Robledo *et al.*, 2016), and have been used to infer extinction risk from climate
71 change across taxa and geographic locations (Sekercioglu *et al.*, 2007; Colwell *et al.*,
72 2008; Feeley & Silman, 2010; La Sorte & Jetz, 2010; Mekasha *et al.*, 2013; La Sorte *et*
73 *al.*, 2014), but little is known about how elevational ranges vary in tropical insects. Here
74 we assess the variation in elevational specialization across several insect taxa **along an**
75 **elevational transect** in Brazilian Atlantic Forest, and the likely implications for
76 conservation under climate change.

77 One of the reasons for the expected high impact of global warming on tropical
78 montane organisms is their thermal specialization (e.g. Garcia-Robledo *et al.*, 2016).
79 Janzen (1967) proposed that organisms on tropical mountains (as opposed to temperate
80 mountains) experience low seasonal variation in temperature but high variation along
81 elevational gradients. He suggested that this selected organisms for narrow thermal
82 tolerance compared to those on temperate mountains, **because organisms would not**
83 **need tolerance to a broad range of thermal regimes at any altitude, and could reduce the**
84 **cost of thermal tolerance by becoming more thermally specialized.** Janzen's (1967)
85 assumptions and predictions have been tested by many authors and general support has
86 been found (e.g. Huey, 1976; Ghalambor *et al.*, 2006; McCain 2009; Bonebrake &
87 Deutsch, 2012; but see Buckley *et al.*, 2013). Spatial and temporal variation in local

1
2
3 88 temperature also predicts thermal tolerances in insect species globally (Bonebrake &
4
5 Deutsch, 2012). However, high elevation insects are predicted to have **wider** elevational
6 ranges than low elevation species, because seasonal temperature range tends to increase
7 with altitude (Stevens 1992). **Thus, high elevation species may require broader thermal**
8 **tolerances than lowland species, which also adapts them for wider elevational ranges**
9 **(Stevens, 1992).**
10
11
12

13 94 However, the elevational ranges of tropical insects along altitudinal gradients
14 95 have rarely been explicitly analyzed, with most studies that contain pertinent data
15 96 focusing on species richness gradients or the shifting of ranges over time (see references
16 97 in Laurance *et al.*, 2011). Consistent with the predictions above, Gaston & Chown
17 98 (1999) found an increase in elevational range with altitude in 26 species of scarab dung
18 99 beetles across an elevational gradient of approximately 2500m in tropical Africa.
19
20 However, studies have also shown evidence for high-elevation endemism and narrow
21 elevational ranges in tropical montane species. Garcia-Robledo *et al.* (2016) found that
22 101 most of the species of rolled-leaf beetles (Chrysomelidae) occurring at mid and high
23 102 elevations in Central American mountains were elevational specialists. **Upper thermal**
24 103 **tolerances were lower amongst high elevation species, presumably because they are less**
25 104 **exposed to high temperatures than low elevation species. In contrast, species found at**
26 105 **low altitudes had high thermal tolerances, and were often not constrained to low**
27 106 **latitudes.** A similar pattern was found in schizophoran flies in the Australian wet
28 107 tropics, with the most restricted species at high elevations (Wilson *et al.*, 2007), **which**
29 108 **was attributed to the effects of past climate change in generating a high degree of**
30 109 **endemism amongst cool-adapted species.** Together these variable findings suggest that
31 110 there may be considerable variation in elevational specialization across taxa and
32 111 geographic locations.
33
34

35 113 Laurance *et al.* (2011) compiled data from 150 studies of species' elevational
36 114 specialization in the tropics, including insect and other invertebrate studies, and
37 115 assessed the degree of specialization to either the lower or upper half of the altitudinal
38 116 ranges sampled. They found that about 75% of species were elevational specialists, and
39 117 lower zone specialists (~50%) were more common than upper zone specialists (~20%).
40 118 Upper zone specialists were more common in ectothermic vertebrates and plants than
41 119 endothermic vertebrates, with invertebrates at intermediate values. However, the median
42 120 elevation considered varied markedly across studies, and there was no control for
43
44

1
2
3 121 species' abundance across taxa, which are potential sources of bias. In addition, there
4 122 was no explicit consideration of heterogeneity across insect taxa.
5
6

7 123 In this paper we assess the degree of elevational specialization **along an**
8 124 **elevational transect** in Brazilian Atlantic Rainforest. We combine the results of
9 125 collections of several insect taxa using different sampling techniques, and ask how the
10 126 degree of elevational specialization varies across taxa, the functional groups to which
11 127 they belong, and between elevation zones. We then assess the likely implications for the
12 128 conservation of tropical insect diversity. The biodiversity hotspot known as Brazilian
13 129 Atlantic Rainforest is distributed across a heterogenous landscape that includes
14 130 ombrophilous forests, semi-deciduous forests, mountain cloud forests, Campos de
15 131 Altitude (also known as Brazilian páramos), inselbergs, *restingas*, and mangroves, with
16 132 varying levels of endemism (Safford, 1999; Ribeiro *et al.*, 2009). Habitat heterogeneity
17 133 is thought to be a main driver of endemism either due to niche divergence and
18 134 ecological speciation (Nosil, 2012), or by niche conservatism leading to isolation in
19 135 refugia, areas of relative climatic stability such as tropical mountain ranges (Carnaval &
20 136 Moritz, 2008; Steinbauer *et al.*, 2016). Currently, less than 10% of the 150 million ha
21 137 originally covered by Brazilian Atlantic Rainforest is left as remnants of varied size and
22 138 connectivity (Ab'Sáber, 2003; Morelatto & Haddad, 2000; Ribeiro *et al.*, 2009).
23
24 139
25
26 140
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

141 **Material and Methods**

142

143 **Study area**

144 The study was conducted along an elevation transect at Serra dos Órgãos National Park
145 (22°32'S and 43°07'W), in the State of Rio de Janeiro (Brazil) (Figures 1, 2), a
146 mountainous conservation area of 20,024 ha. The Park encompasses the highest peaks
147 of the Serra do Mar, ranging from 80-2263m elevation. It was founded in 1939 and is
148 the third oldest National Park in Brazil, aiming to conserve montane biodiversity,
149 especially the Campos de Altitude (high elevation grasslands), which contain a great
150 part of the endemism in the area. The region is among the best preserved in the Atlantic
151 Forest biome (Castro, 2008), although much of the forest is secondary growth. The Park
152 encloses four different vegetation belts: lower montane forest (below ~800m), montane
153 forest (800~1500m), upper montane forest (1500~2000m) and high elevation
154 grasslands, Campos de Altitude (over ~2000m), characterized by shrubs, herbs and
155 grasses (Rizzini, 1954; Veloso *et al.*, 1991) (Figure 1).

156 The climate is marked by a drier cool season, a hot season of high precipitation,
157 and temperature reduction with elevation (Viveiros de Castro, 2008). Superhumid
158 conditions prevail for most of the year, marked by intense rainfall from November to
159 March (460mm mean monthly rainfall), while the drier season (though still humid)
160 extends from June to August (49mm mean monthly rainfall). The coolest months are
161 between May and August (mean 16.4°C), and the hottest from December to March
162 (mean 21.1°C) (Flinte *et al.*, 2009).

163 Temperature loggers placed at 15 sampling locations, covering the same route as
164 those presented elsewhere in this paper, throughout 2015 showed that mean annual
165 temperature decreases consistently with elevation, from 22.5°C at 130m to 12.8°C at
166 2130m elevation, a 0.5°C decrease per 100m elevation. The mean monthly temperature
167 at each elevation ranges over $5.7^{\circ}\text{C} \pm 0.4^{\circ}\text{C}$. The ratio of spatial (across sites) to
168 seasonal (within sites, across months) variation in temperature ranges from 1.5 to 2,
169 which is in the higher range of values globally, typical of tropical mountains
170 (Bonebrake & Deutsch, 2012), and likely to favour elevational specialization.

171 Insect sampling took place over a 9 year period (see below), and over this time
172 there is the potential for significant weather changes and potentially some biotic range
173 shifting. Data from an automated weather station at 991m along the sampling route
174 show that 2007 and 2015 (the main sampling years) had similar average temperature

1
2
3 175 though 2015 was drier (mean monthly temperature 2007: 18.1°C, SD 2.2 °C; 2015: 18.8
4 °C, SD 2.2 °C, total rainfall 2007: 2591mm; 2015: 2019mm). Between 2007 and 2015,
5 both the rainfall and mean monthly temperature trends were non-significant
6 (temperature Pearson's $R = 0.546$, $n = 9$, $P = 0.128$; rainfall $R = -0.354$, $n = 9$, $P =$
7 0.351), though over longer time periods significant trends are expected to emerge.
8
9 179
10 180
11
12
13 181 **Field sampling methods**
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

182 To maximize taxonomic comparisons, we compiled data from several separate samples
183 aimed at different taxa using different methods. Sampling locations followed the path of
184 the road from Guapimirim up to Teresópolis (land inside the park boundary), and then
185 from the Park entrance at Teresópolis up the Pedra do Sino trail (Figure 2, for exact
186 sampling locations see Supporting Information).

187 Scarabaeinae (Coleoptera: Scarabaeidae) were sampled in January 2014, at 50 m
188 intervals from 100 to 2000 m elevation. At each site, the beetles were sampled using
189 three pitfall traps (14cm diameter) containing a solution of water, detergent and salt.
190 They were baited with human faeces, suspended in a small plastic cup (4.5cm diameter)
191 at ground level over the pitfall trap with wire. A plastic rain-lid was placed 15cm over
192 the top of the trap supported by wooden skewers placed in the ground. Traps at the same
193 elevation were 50m apart. The traps were left for 48 hours and the beetles captured were
194 taken to the laboratory and preserved in 98% ethanol.

195 Eumolpinae (Coleoptera: Chrysomelidae) and Lampyridae (Coleoptera) were
196 sampled using pairs (100m apart) of Malaise (flight interception) traps at 360 m, 550 m,
197 700 m, 880 m, 1070 m, 1250 m, 1480 m, 1680 m, 1810 m, 1940 m, 2030 m and 2170 m
198 elevation. The Lampyridae samples were considered from December 2014 to December
199 2015 and the Eumolpinae from December 2014 to February 2015.

200 Tiphidae (Hymenoptera) were sampled using pairs of Malaise (flight interception)
201 traps (100m apart) at each of just four different elevations, 360 m, 1250 m, 1480 m, and
202 2170 m, from December 2014 to February 2015.

203 Braconidae (Hymenoptera), Chrysomelidae (all subfamilies), Coccinellidae and
204 Curculionidae (Coleoptera) were sampled with yellow sticky traps (Bio Trap®,
205 Biocontrole, São Paulo, Brazil). Traps consisted of a plastic yellow panel (24.5cm x
206 10cm) with adhesive on both sides. They were attached with wire to vegetation 1.5 to
207 2m above the ground. Seven panels were placed approximately 20m apart from each
208 other in the vegetation, on slopes of aspect within 45° of north, at each of just four

1
2
3 different elevations: 350 m, 1280 m, 1480 m and 2100 m. Sampling was conducted
4 every two months from February 2007 to February 2008, resulting in seven week-long
5 samples. Placement of new traps, and their retrieval one week later, occurred on a single
6 day. Retrieved panels were placed in plastic containers and separated from each other
7 by small wooden cubes, taken to the laboratory and stored in the freezer.
8
9

10
11 Trap effectiveness is an important issue in assessing species diversity (Southwood,
12 1978). The sampling methods used here are widely known as effective for these
13 respective groups. Coleoptera and Hymenoptera are widely studied using Malaise traps
14 (e.g. Fraser *et al.*, 2007; Ohsawa, 2010) and yellow sticky traps (e.g. Larsen *et al.*, 2014,
15 Thomson *et al.*, 2004). For Scarabaeinae, human faeces-baited pitfalls are one of the
16 most effective sampling methods (e.g. Silva *et al.*, 2012).
17
18

19 Where sampling took place for less than a year, the period considered was always
20 the warmer wetter season (December to February), during which insect species richness
21 and abundance are generally greatest (e.g. Flinte *et al.*, 2009). Species whose adult
22 phenology is restricted to other times of year will have been omitted by this sampling,
23 and this should be born in mind when interpreting the results. In addition, because the
24 sticky trap sampling (Braconidae, Chrysomelidae, Coccinellidae and Curculionidae)
25 occurred some eight years earlier than the other sampling, taxonomic comparisons may
26 be most robust within rather than between these sampling periods, since taxa in the
27 2014-2015 samples may have shifted range slightly during the intervening period.
28
29

30 **Species sorting and identification**

31 Sticky traps were individually submersed in paint thinner for five minutes to dissolve
32 the glue, and insects were carefully removed with a thin brush. This procedure was
33 undertaken in a fume hood with use of a gas mask. All detached material was sifted,
34 washed and stored in 70% ethanol. Adults of Braconidae (CVSG), Chrysomelidae (VF),
35 Coccinellidae (ROA) and Curculionidae (VF and COA) were identified to
36 morphospecies after first keying to the lowest taxonomic level possible, normally
37 species or genus. Eumolpinae (CC), Lampyridae (LFLS) and Tippiidae (ES) were
38 removed from the Malaise traps monthly and identified to morphospecies, also after
39 first keying to the lowest taxonomic level possible, normally species or genus. The
40 Scarabaeidae were first identified by Raissa Dufrayer and then confirmed by Prof.
41 Fernando Zagury Vaz de Melo (Universidade Federal de Lavras), again mostly to
42 species and genus level and then to morphospecies. Specimens were deposited in the
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2 243 collection of the Insect Ecology Laboratory (CLEI) at the Federal University of Rio de
3 244 Janeiro.
4
5 245

6
7 246 **Data analysis**
8
9

10 247 We conducted analyses on two different subsets of the data; first, we followed Laurance
11 248 *et al.* (2011) in maximizing inclusion of taxa by defining only two different altitudinal
12 249 zones (two-zone analysis) divided at the median sampling elevation. To ensure equal
13 250 sampling effort in the two zones, we included data from only four elevations, one each
14 251 approximating the four vegetation zones to minimize potential sampling bias, guided by
15 252 the lowest common sampling effort across taxa. This analysis allows us to compare our
16 253 findings directly with Laurance *et al.* (2011). The exact samples were: Eumolpinae,
17 254 Lampyridae and Tiphidae: 360 m and 1250 m in the lower-zone and 1480 m and 2170 m
18 255 in the upper-zone; Scarabaeinae: 350 m and 1250 m in the lower-zone and 1450 m and
19 256 2000 m in the upper-zone; Braconidae, Chrysomelidae and Curculionidae: 350 m and
20 257 1280 m in the lower-zone, and 1480 m and 2100m in the upper-zone.
21
22

23 258 In a different subset of the data, we doubled the number of altitudinal zones
24 259 sampled (four-zone analysis, approximating one of each of the four vegetation zones),
25 260 but this analysis could only be carried out for Eumolpinae, Lampyridae and
26 261 Scarabaeinae, which have the necessary finer sample distributions. Sampling effort was
27 262 equal across zones for Eumolpinae and Lampyridae, and the same number of elevations
28 263 per zone was sampled for Scarabaeinae (though the sampling method was different).
29 264 Finer altitudinal intervals were not considered because sample sizes became too small
30 265 for community analyses. In order to standardize the sampling intensity and elevations
31 266 across taxa and reduce potential biases, we used only the following samples from each
32 267 taxon: Scarabaeinae: 350 m, 500 m and 700 m approximating the lower montane forest,
33 268 850 m, 1050 m and 1250 m approximating the montane forest, 1450 m, 1600 m and
34 269 1800 m approximating the upper montane forest and 1900 m, 1950 m and 2000 m
35 270 approximating Campos de Altitude; Eumolpinae and Lampyridae: 360 m, 550 m and
36 271 700 m for lower montane forest, 880 m, 1070 m and 1250 m for montane forest, 1480
37 272 m, 1680 m and 1810 m for upper montane forest and 1940 m, 2030 m and 2170 m for
38 273 Campos de Altitude.
39
40

41 274 For each of these subsets of the data we carried out three analyses. First, to
42 275 compare with the results of Laurance *et al.* (2011), we defined species as specialists if
43 276 they were restricted to a single zone. Differences in the proportion of specialists across
44
45

1
2
3 zones and taxa were assessed with χ^2 tests on the species counts, and pairwise
4 comparisons made using the same tests but controlling for the family-wide false
5 discovery rate (Benjamini & Hochberg, 1995) using the fifer package in R (R core team,
6 2015). The above analysis was conducted with the complete dataset, which has the
7 advantage of considering all species together, but assumes that the species with low
8 abundance in our samples are elevational specialists. This may indeed be the case, but it
9 is possible that rare species are simply poorly sampled species (which may have large
10 elevational ranges), in which case the analysis of elevational specialization needs to
11 control for sampling abundance.
12
13
14
15
16
17

18 We therefore carried out two analyses that controlled for sampling abundance. In
19 a similar community-level analysis, we carried out the same analyses above but only
20 considering species with at least five individuals **sampled (e.g. following the approach**
21 **of Wilson *et al.* (2007)**. Some of the finer scale tests were omitted because sample size
22 was smaller in this dataset due to the omission of many rare species. **To visually assess**
23 **the effect of this cutoff on inclusion across taxonomic groups, rank-abundance plots**
24 **were constructed for the different taxa and sample designs.**
25
26
27
28
29

30 We also used a species-focused rather than community-focused approach. For
31 each species we counted the number of elevational zones in-and-between the highest
32 and lowest zones in which it was found. This number of zones (out of the total of four
33 for the four-zone analysis, or simply presence in two zones or not in the two-zone
34 analysis) was then subjected to a **generalized** linear model with a binomial error
35 structure using the `glm` function in R (R core team, 2015). The explanatory variable was
36 the interaction between \log_{10} abundance and taxon. This effectively asks if the slope of
37 the relationship between \log_{10} abundance and observed elevational range is different for
38 different taxa; taxa with high slopes tend to have wide elevational ranges at high
39 abundance, and taxa with low slopes have narrower elevational ranges at high
40 abundance (all species have narrow elevational ranges at low abundance). Differences
41 between taxa were tested by merging the factor levels designating taxon identity and
42 observing the significance of the change in model deviance with a χ^2 test. Checks for
43 overdispersion were made by dividing the residual deviance of models by the residual
44 degrees of freedom, but none of the models indicated overdispersion as this ratio was
45 always < 1 .
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55

56 In order to assess the completeness of our sampling, we compared observed
57 richness for each sample design and taxon with estimates of asymptotic richness, and
58
59
60

1
2
3 311 plotted associated species accumulation curves. Because of the diversity of sampling
4 312 approaches used, accumulation approaches based on individuals rather than samples are
5 313 most applicable, straightforward and comparable: in the vegan package in R rarefaction
6 314 curves were constructed on the species abundance data using the 'rarefy' function, and
7 315 Chao1 (Chao, 1984) and the Abundance-based Coverage Estimator (ACE, Chao 2005)
8 316 measures of asymptotic richness made using the 'estimateR' function.
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For Review Only

320 **Results**321 **Sampling completeness and rank abundance**

322 Over the whole of the two-zone dataset, species continued to accumulate as more
323 individuals were added (Figure 3a), and the Chao1 and ACE estimators are nearly
324 double that of observed richness (Table 1). Examination of individual taxa (Table 1,
325 Figure S1) shows that this undersampling was mostly due to the three richest taxa
326 (Braconidae, Chrysomelidae and Curculionidae); in contrast the other taxa
327 (Coccinellidae, Lampyridae, Tiphidae and Scarabaeinae) were relatively completely
328 sampled. In the four-zone analysis by contrast, species richness had nearly asymptoted
329 (Figure 3b), and the Chao1 and ACE estimators were only slightly higher than observed
330 richness (Table 1). This is true of all three taxa (Figure S1), none of which are very rich
331 (Table 1), but all of which are better sampled in terms of numbers of individuals than in
332 the two-zones analysis.

333 In the four-zone sample design, rank abundance plots are fairly similar in the three taxa
334 considered (Figure S2), with fewest rare species in the Scarabaeinae, most in the
335 Eumolpinae, with Lampyridae in between. In the two zone analysis, rank abundance
336 plots differ more markedly across taxa, with Braconidae and Curculionidae having
337 shallow curves with many rare species, Chrysomelidae a concave curve with many rare
338 species and several abundant species, and Tiphidae, Coccinellidae and Scarabaeinae
339 having steep curves with few rare species and a few abundant species (Figure S2).
340 Lampyridae has a curve of intermediate steepness.

341 **Specialization to upper and lower zones**

342 In the two-zone samples there were 6577 individuals in 697 species of the seven insect
343 taxa sampled (Braconidae, Chrysomelidae, Coccinellidae, Curculionidae, Lampyridae,
344 Scarabaeinae and Tiphidae; **exact counts of each species per zone are given in the**
345 **Supporting Information**). Across all species sampled, 77.2% were found in only one of
346 the two zones. In the lower zone, 66.5% of species were specialized, and 58.3% in the
347 upper zone, a small but significant difference (Figure 4a). Differences across zones
348 were, however, not generally significant for individual taxa, except for Scarabaeinae.
349 The proportion of elevation specialists differed across taxa and was highest in
350 Chrysomelidae, Curculionidae, and Lampyridae and lowest in Tiphidae and

1
2
3 351 Coccinellidae (Figure 5a). Taxonomic differences in specialization were generally
4 similar in the upper and lower zones. Pooling species from the same functional groups,
5 unsurprisingly, trophic groups differed significantly ($\chi^2_3 = 24.76, P < 0.0001$). There
6 were more herbivore specialists than predators ($P_{adj} = 0.0098$) and parasitoids ($P_{adj} =$
7
8 0.0001), although no other trophic groups differed significantly ($P_{adj} = 1.00$).
9
10

11
12 356 In the analysis including only the 182 species with at least five sampled individuals, 73
13 species (40.1%) were elevational specialists, comprising 28.8% of species in the lower
14 zone and 21.0% of species in the upper zone, (a non-significant difference, Figure 4b),
15 so as in the all-species analysis, the level of specialization was not much higher in the
16 lower zone (Figure 4a,b). For individual taxa, the only group to show a difference in
17 specialization in the two zones was Tiphidae, which was more specialized in the lower
18 than upper zone (Figure 4b). Differences across taxa were again found in the degree of
19 specialization, but they were different to those found when all species were analyzed
20 (Figure 5b). Now, Lampyridae contained the highest proportion of specialists, and
21 Braconidae the lowest. Chrysomelidae, Scarabaeinae and Curculionidae had reasonably
22 high proportions of specialists, and Tiphidae and Coccinellidae quite low proportions.
23 Functional groups again differed in their specialization ($\chi^2_3 = 18.64, P = 0.0002$). Across
24 functional groups, herbivores, predators and saprotrophs now had similar levels of
25 specialization ($P_{adj} = 0.99$), with parasitoids having lower levels than all three others
26 ($P_{adj} < 0.05$).
27
28

29 371 In the species-focused analysis, the taxon with the highest slope of the relationship
30 between logit probability of occupying two zones and log abundance (hence the
31 broadest elevational ranges for abundant species) was Braconidae ($b = 7.422, SE =$
32 0.818, $P < 0.001$), followed by Coccinellidae ($b = 5.019, SE = 0.953, P < 0.001$),
33 Curculionidae ($b = 3.652, SE = 0.532, P < 0.001$), Tiphidae ($b = 3.231, SE = 0.523, P$
34 < 0.001), Chrysomelidae ($b = 2.593, SE = 0.322, P < 0.001$), Scarabaeinae ($b = 2.304,$
35 $SE = 0.508, P < 0.001$), and Lampyridae ($b = 1.737, SE = 0.424, P < 0.001$) (Figure 6a).
36
37 378 This is a different rank order of elevational specialization than found in the community-
38 focused analysis with all species, but, unsurprisingly, similar to the results of the
39 community analysis restricted to species with > 4 individuals, as both effectively ignore
40 rare species. Across trophic groups, results were similar. The group with the highest
41 slope of the relationship between logit probability of occupying two zones and log
42 abundance was the parasitoids ($b = 5.353, SE = 0.559, P < 0.001$), followed by
43
44

1
2
3 384 herbivores ($b = 2.586$, SE = 0.259, $P < 0.001$), predators ($b = 2.317$, SE = 0.334, $P <$
4
5 385 0.001), and saprotrophs ($b = 2.116$, SE = 0.489, $P < 0.001$) (Figure 6b). The predators,
6
7 386 herbivores and saprotrophs did not have significantly different slopes ($\chi^2_2 = 1.06$, $P =$
8
9 387 0.588), but the parasitoids had significantly higher slopes than the other species
10
11 388 combined ($\chi^2_1 = 44.19$, $P < 0.001$). Again, this is a different rank order of elevational
12
13 389 specialization than found in the community analysis with all species, but similar to the
14
15 390 results of the community analysis restricted to species with > 4 individuals.
16
17
18 391
19
20 392 **Specialization across four vegetation zones.**
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

393 A total of 3874 individuals belonging to 156 species of Eumolpinae, Lampyridae and
394 Scarabaeinae were collected using the four-zone analysis. Overall, 53.8% of species
395 were found in one zone only. For the lower montane forest 33.3% were specialized, for
396 the montane forest 32.6%, upper montane forest 31.9%, and Campos de Altitude 41.2%.
397 Considering all the insect species together there was no significant difference in the
398 relative frequencies of specialists in each zone (Figure 7a). The only significant
399 difference in elevational specialization detected across zones was the low level of
400 specialization in the upper montane forest in the lampyrids (Figure 7a). The total
401 proportion of elevational specialists among the Eumolpinae was significantly higher
402 than those among the Lampyridae and the Scarabaeinae (Figure 8a).

403 When only species with > 4 individuals sampled were included, results again differed
404 from when all sampled species were included. Now only 37.6% of species were
405 specialists on one of the four zones, including 14.7% of species in lower montane forest,
406 22.0% in montane forest, 12.8% in upper montane forest, and 37.5% of species in
407 Campos de Altitude (Figure 7b). There were also differences across taxa, with
408 Eumolpinae having a higher proportion of specialists than the other two taxa (Figure
409 8b). Specialization was generally low in Scarabaeinae, and non-existent in Campos de
410 Altitude.

411 The species-focused approach largely confirmed the differences in specialization
412 across taxa in the above analysis. The slope of the relationship between logit number of
413 zones and log abundance was not significant for Eumolpinae ($b = 0.316$, SE = 0.180, P
414 = 0.0789) indicating that elevational range does not increase with abundance, but was

1
2
3 significant for Lampyridae ($b = 0.540$, SE = 0.150, $P < 0.001$), and Scarabaeinae ($b =$
4
5 0.713, SE = 1.680, $P < 0.001$) (Figure 6c), and the difference between the slopes was
6
7 different for Eumolpinae and Scarabaeinae ($\chi^2_1 = 3.872$, $P = 0.0491$), but not for
8
9 Eumolpinae and Lampyridae ($\chi^2_1 = 1.479$, $P = 0.224$) or Lampyridae and Scarabaeinae
10
11 ($\chi^2_1 = 0.926$, $P = 0.336$). This suggests that the differences in elevational specialization
12
13 in the full dataset are not simply due to differences in the proportion of rare species, but
14
15 also reflect the elevational ranges of abundant species, which are wider in Scarabaeinae
16
17 than Eumolpinae.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

425 **Discussion**

426 In this paper we investigated levels of elevational specialization across several insect
427 taxa along an elevational transect in Brazilian Atlantic Rainforest. We found strong
428 evidence for taxonomic differences in elevational specialization, and therefore
429 potentially across the functional groups which they represent. We also found differences
430 in the degree of specialization to different elevational belts. Importantly, findings could
431 differ in detail when examined at different spatial scales. Below we consider these
432 findings in a broader context and their implications for the conservation of tropical
433 insects under climate change.

434 To compare our findings with the broad meta-analysis of Laurance *et al.* (2011) we
435 conducted an analysis using maximal taxonomic inclusion and contrasting only two
436 broad elevational zones (lower and upper halves). Our overall findings bear some
437 similarity to theirs. The high percentage of species that are specialists (77%) is typical
438 of tropical studies at this scale, especially on continents and in the neotropics, as ours is.
439 The high proportion of species that were specialized to lower zones was also typical, but
440 we found a high proportion of specialization in the upper elevational zone that has not
441 generally been found in other datasets analyzed in this way. In our dataset this finding is
442 largely driven by the high proportion of upper zone specialists in Chrysomelidae,
443 Curculionidae and Braconidae, which include many species with few individuals
444 sampled, which naturally tends to make them appear in one zone. This feature of the
445 data makes the exact percentage potentially suspect, since although the rarely collected
446 species may genuinely be specialized (e.g., species might have small populations
447 because they are specialized), they may also simply be poorly sampled, and would
448 prove to have wider ranges if sampled better (Wilson *et al.*, 2007). Nonetheless, the
449 high value compared to previous datasets is in line with the known high levels of
450 endemism found in other mountaintop taxa in Brazilian Atlantic Rainforest (Safford,
451 1999; Morellato & Haddad, 2000; Myers *et al.*, 2000), a likely result of the historical
452 interactions between climate and topography (Carmaval & Moritz, 2008; Steinbauer *et*
453 *al.*, 2016).

454 Our data also confirm another general finding of Laurance *et al.* (2011): that of
455 differences in specialization across taxa. In their meta-analysis, differences were
456 confined to the upper zone, but they did not explicitly consider variation across insect

1
2
3 groups. Studies focused on insects, such as ours, are needed to help “defy the curse of
4 ignorance” about the macroecology of this large component of biodiversity (Diniz-Filho
5 *et al.*, 2010). In our equivalent analyses we found strong differences across taxa in both
6 the upper zones and lower zones that were generally consistent except in Scarabaeinae,
7 which were one of the least specialized groups in the upper zone, but most specialized
8 in the lower zone. Our study therefore highlights that taxonomic differences might also
9 exist at lower elevational zones, with potential implications for community structure
10 and function under environmental change.
11
12
13
14
15

16 In order to investigate the robustness of our findings to assumptions about rarely
17 sampled species, we conducted two analyses that effectively ignored them: a
18 community-focused and a species-focused analysis. These produced findings in
19 accordance with each other, but which diverged from the analyses of all species above.
20 In particular, when sufficient data were available to more accurately judge elevational
21 specialization, levels of specialization decreased markedly, although the level of
22 specialization was still similar in the upper and lower zones. **This reduction was likely**
23 **because rarely captured species had fewer opportunities to appear in two or more zones,**
24 **and were excluded in this analysis.** However, different taxa now appeared the most and
25 least specialized, with Lampyridae the highest and Braconidae the lowest. This indicates
26 that the high level of specialization shown by Chrysomelidae and Curculionidae is not
27 retained at this scale when only quite abundant species are considered. **For the**
28 **Curculionidae this is surprising as the most abundant species are never extremely**
29 **abundant (see Figure S2), and high elevational specialization might be expected to**
30 **remain, suggesting that a larger fraction of species in this group cross the boundary**
31 **between upper and lower halves of the transect.** Abundant braconids are also nearly
32 always elevationally widespread, whilst, in contrast, abundant lampyrids are often very
33 elevationally specialized.
34
35

36 The reduced level of specialization in Chrysomelidae and Curculionidae in the more
37 restricted dataset does not necessarily mean that the higher levels in the full dataset were
38 an artefact; it just means that the true elevational ranges of the rarely-collected species
39 need further study (Wilson *et al.*, 2007). This alternative view of the different taxa also
40 has consequences for the way functional groups are viewed: the herbivores we studied
41 are the most specialized trophic group if all species are included, but if rarely-collected
42 species are ignored, herbivores do not differ from predators and saprotrophs, and
43
44

1
2
3 490 parasitoids are the most generalist in elevation. Overall then these new analyses suggest
4
5 that the findings of studies that include all taxa collected may not hold if rare species'
6 elevational ranges are underestimated by the data.
7
8

9 493 Since we had comparable data at finer elevational scales for three taxa, we could also
10
11 investigate the effect of increasing the number of elevational zones. Overall there was a
12
13 lower proportion of specialists when elevation zones are more finely divided. **This is**
14
15 **unsurprising, as species ranging over two of the four zones would never appear as**
16
17 **specialists in the four-zone analysis, but could do in the two-zone analysis if those zones**
18
19 **were restricted to the top or bottom halves of the mountain.** Between the four zones
20
21 there was also not much difference in specialization overall. There were consistent
22
23 differences across taxa, with Eumolpinae showing higher levels of specialization than
24
25 the other two taxa, and importantly this difference was retained when rarely-collected
26
27 species were ignored. The difference was most marked amongst the higher elevational
28
29 zones. At this spatial scale, the Lampyridae were not the most elevationally specialized
30
31 when rarely-collected species were ignored, **but elevational range still only rises quite**
32
33 **slowly with abundance for both them and Scarabaeinae (Figure 6c), indicating that there**
34
35 **are still many range restricted species at this scale.** The chief difference between the
36
37 **two-zone and four-zone analysis in these taxa is that specialization differs between**
38
39 **zones for Scarabaeinae in the two-zone analysis (Figure 4), but never in the four zone**
40
41 **analysis (Figure 7).** This implies that the degree of specialization at low elevations is not
42
43 **very high in this group, thus being lost when finer scales are examined.**

44 511 Several factors are likely to contribute to different taxa displaying different levels of
45
46 elevational specialization. Dispersal tendency, habitat specialization, the tendency and
47
48 speed of ecological speciation, and the tolerance of environmental gradients are all
49
50 likely candidates (Magurran & May, 1999; Schluter, 2000; Coyne and Orr, 2004; Nosil,
51
52 2012), but these are very difficult to quantify for a single taxon, less alone several. The
53
54 Chrysomelidae contains subfamilies with different feeding habits and host plant
55
56 specificity, but the Galerucinae and Eumolpinae comprise around 95% of the
57
58 individuals on one tropical mountain (Bouzan *et al.*, 2015). These subfamilies have
59
60 root-feeding larvae and the adults feed on foliage (Jolivet & Hawkeswood, 1995). Curculionidae adults are typically found on foliage or flowers, and most larvae are subterranean or internal feeders (Daly *et al.*, 1998). Although these feeding habits are considered among those with low host specificity amongst herbivores (Novotny &

1
2 Basset, 2005), herbivorous insects on mountains may have characteristics that can
3 restrict their elevational-range both in evolutionary and ecological time, such as limited
4 dispersal (e.g. Rank, 1992) and tight dependence upon host phenology and distribution,
5 which can greatly vary along elevational gradients (e.g. Merrill *et al.*, 2008).
6
7

8
9 Lampyridae have soft carapaces compared to other Coleoptera, and are often associated
10 with moist environments (Branham, 2010), so they may require particular adaptations to
11 different physical conditions, which could also encourage elevational specialization.
12 They also commonly show intensive sexual selection (Lewis & Cratsley, 1988; South *et*
13 *al.*, 2011) and many have poorly dispersive females (Cicero, 1988; Bocak *et al.*, 2008;
14 South *et al.*, 2011; Silveira *et al.*, 2016), which might encourage ecological speciation
15 and subdivision of the ecological niche by elevation. Some of the common braconids
16 might be ecological- or host-generalists, encouraging broader ecological tolerances and
17 elevational ranges. The two species which ranged all the way from the lowest to the
18 highest sampling sites belong to genera known for their generalist habits: *Bracon* (Shaw
19 & Huddleston, 1991) and *Ascogaster* (e.g. Stiling, 2004). The most species rich genus
20 was the generalist *Heterospilus* (Cirelli & Penteado-Dias, 2003), and all species with >
21 4 individuals occurred in both the upper and lower elevational zones.
22
23

24
25 Our study has implications for the conservation of tropical insects under climate change.
26 It is widely recognized that species' ranges may be moving uphill in response to
27 warming climates, both in temperate zones and in the tropics (Konvicka *et al.*, 2003;
28 Pounds *et al.*, 2006; Chen *et al.*, 2009; Forero-Medina *et al.*, 2011; Telwala *et al.*, 2013).
29 Species confined to high elevational zones are likely to be most at risk because tracking
30 suitable climates will require dispersing across warmer areas of lower and less suitable
31 elevation. Our finding that a higher proportion of species is confined to high elevational
32 zones in this study from Brazilian Atlantic Rainforest (up to 58% as opposed to the
33 ~20% found generally in invertebrates) suggests that previous general figures may
34 underestimate the risk to many tropical insects, especially those in rich zones of
35 endemism. The Brazilian Atlantic Rainforest is known to contain many endemic species
36 that account for a high proportion of richness (Safford, 1999; Ribeiro *et al.*, 2009),
37 including many in the Campos de Altitude (Macedo *et al.*, 2016). It is important
38 therefore to establish if this is also true of insects in other tropical zones of endemism.
39 In addition, it is crucial to establish to what extent vegetation changes can be expected,
40 particularly in the high altitude zones (Safford, 1999). Naively, one might expect the
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 556 tree line to shift uphill under warming, leading to the loss of the Campos de Altitude
4
5 557 and its endemic species. However, the tree line in Brazilian Atlantic Forest may not be
6
7 determined solely by temperature, but also by edaphic factors, as well as disturbance
8
9 559 such as fire (Safford, 1999). Under such a scenario the habitat might remain in a
10
11 560 modified state, although insects with low upper thermal tolerance might nonetheless go
12
13 561 extinct.

14
15 562 The level of specialization to the lower of two zones that we found is also high, but
16
17 563 more in accord with previous work (Laurance *et al.*, 2011). It is uncertain whether low
18
19 564 elevation tropical species are more or less at risk from climate change. Low elevation
20
21 565 tropical species might be adapted to a narrower range of conditions than high elevation
22
23 566 tropical species, which might make them more susceptible to climate change if they
24
25 567 cannot move uphill due to lack of contiguous higher elevation sites (Bonebrake &
26
27 568 Deutsch, 2012). On the other hand, if such sites are available, low elevation species
28
29 569 might better resist climate change, but even so low elevation sites might become
30
31 570 impoverished as species move uphill (Colwell *et al.*, 2008).

32
33 571 Our finding that different insect taxa have different degrees of elevational
34
35 572 specialization, and to different zones, may mean that the taxonomic composition of
36
37 573 insect communities will shift under climate change (e.g. Zografou *et al.*, 2014; Nieto-
38
39 574 Sánchez *et al.*, 2015) especially if some are more vulnerable to extinction. Our work
40
41 575 highlights the likely local loss of many Chrysomelidae (especially Eumolpinae),
42
43 576 possibly Curculionidae and also Lampyridae, all of which show high degrees of
44
45 577 elevational specialization, but it is possible that many abundant Braconidae and
46
47 578 Scarabaeinae will be less affected. The former are especially worrisome because of their
48
49 579 very high species richness. Although strong conclusions cannot be made about
50
51 580 functional groups given the small number of taxonomic groups contributing to each, and
52
53 581 especially since we have ignored here the effects of biotic interactions with other
54
55 582 species under climate change, our data suggest the hypothesis that the more abundant
56
57 583 tropical parasitoids will be fairly immune from the effects of climate change whilst
584 herbivores may be more at risk. This is potentially at odds with some previous work that
585 suggests that higher trophic levels may be more at risk under climate change for other
586 reasons (Voigt *et al.*, 2003; Zarnetske *et al.*, 2012). More data from other groups is
587 needed to test this more rigorously.

1
2
3 588 Our conclusions come with several caveats. Sampling periods and methods varied
4 589 across taxa and sampling efficacy too, caveats which are, however, even more
5 590 applicable to a previous meta-analytical study (Laurance *et al.*, 2011), but naturally less
6 591 so to other studies that have considered fewer taxa (e.g. Wilson *et al.*, 2007). Even so,
7 592 some of our major conclusions are likely robust to these problems because they consider
8 593 identical sampling periods and methods: for example, the differences between
9 594 Braconidae, Curculionidae, Chrysomelidae and Coccinellidae in the two-zone analyses.
10 595 Although several of our (less species rich) taxa appear to have been fairly completely
11 596 sampled within the confines of the altitudes and months considered, our analyses show
12 597 that for three taxa (Braconidae, Chrysomelidae and Curculionidae) many more species
13 598 would be found through further sampling. Thus, the high level of specialization found in
14 599 Curculionidae and Chrysomelidae in the two-zones analysis which included rare species
15 600 would likely be even more extreme than that found, had more sampling been done. This
16 601 again, however, suggests that some differences between taxa are also quite robust to
17 602 undersampling since further sampling would only exacerbate a trend already present in
18 603 the data.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

604 In summary, we have provided data that show a high level of high elevational
605 specialization of insects in a tropical biodiversity hotspot, implying a higher level of
606 climate-induced extinction risk than might previously have been assumed. The data also
607 imply differences in elevational specialization amongst taxonomic and trophic groups
608 that hold the potential for changes in community structure and function under climate
609 change. We have also shown that the treatment of rarely-observed species can matter
610 when assessing the elevational specialization of communities, as well as the way in
611 which elevational zones are treated. These findings should help future researchers to
612 better understand how tropical insect communities are distributed across elevations, and
613 the consequences for conservation under climate change.
614

615 Acknowledgements

616 We thank Raissa Dufrayer and Prof. Fernando Zagury Vaz de Melo for help identifying
617 Scarabaeinae, and Jessica Viana and Ethel Henz for help separating Eumolpinae and
618 Curculionidae into morphospecies. We also thank Cecilia Cronemberger (ICMBIO/
619 Serra dos Órgãos National Park) for research support in the field. Two anonymous

1
2
3 620 referees and Cang Hui made helpful comments on the manuscript. The Research Sector
4
5 621 of the Serra dos Órgãos National Park made available the climate data reported in the
6
7 622 methods. CNPQ provided postdoc scholarships to EFS and VF. CAPES and/or FAPERJ
8
9 623 provided PhD scholarships to COA and LFLS and Masters scholarships to CVSG, GK
10
11 624 and ROA. FAPERJ, CNPq, FAPESP and CAPES provided the laboratory with financial
12
13 support through projects within PENSA RIO, INCT Hympar and PVE.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For Review Only

626 **References**

- 627 Ab'Sáber, A.N. (2003) *Os domínios de natureza no Brasil: potencialidades*
628 *paisagísticas* (Vol. 1). Ateliê Editorial, São Paulo, Brasil.
- 629 Addo-Bediako, A., Chown, S.L. & Gaston, K.J. (2000) Thermal tolerance, climatic
630 variability and latitude. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London B: Biological*
631 *Sciences*, **267**, 739-745.
- 632 Benjamini, Y. & Hochberg, Y. (1995) Controlling the false discovery rate: a practical
633 and powerful approach to multiple testing. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Series B*,
634 **57**, 289-300.
- 635 Bocak, L., Bocakova, M., Hunt, T., & Vogler, A.P. (2008) Multiple ancient origins of
636 neoteny in Lycidae (Coleoptera): consequences for ecology and macroevolution.
637 *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London B: Biological Sciences*, **275**, 2015-2023.
- 638 Bonebrake, T.C. & Deutsch, C.A. (2012) Climate heterogeneity modulates impact of
639 warming on tropical insects. *Ecology*, **93**, 449-455.
- 640 Bouzan, A.M., Flint, V., Macedo, M.V. & Monteiro, R.F. (2015) Elevation and
641 temporal distributions of Chrysomelidae in southeast Brazil with emphasis on the
642 Galerucinae. *ZooKeys*, **547**, 103-117.
- 643 Branham, M. (2010) 4.15 Lampyridae Latreille, 1817. *Handbook of Zoology*, **4**, 141-
644 145.
- 645 Brierley, A.S. & Kingsford, M.J. (2009) Impacts of climate change on marine
646 organisms and ecosystems. *Current Biology*, **19**, R602-R614.
- 647 Buckley, L.B., Miller, E.F. & Kingsolver, J. G. (2014) Ectotherm thermal stress and
648 specialization across altitude and latitude. *Integrative and Comparative Biology*, **53**,
649 571-581.
- 650 Carnaval, A.C. & Moritz, C. (2008) Historical climate modelling predicts patterns of
651 current biodiversity in the Brazilian Atlantic forest. *Journal of Biogeography*, **35**, 1187-
652 1201.

- 1
2
3 653 Castro, E.B. V. (Org.) (2008) *Plano de manejo do Parque Nacional da Serra dos*
4
5 654 *Órgão*. ICMBio, Brasil.
- 6
7 655 Chao, A. (1984) Nonparametric estimation of the number of classes in a population.
8
9 656 *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics*, **11**, 265-270.
- 10
11 657 Chao, A. (2005) Species estimation and applications. *Encyclopedia of Statistical*
12
13 658 *Sciences*. Wiley, New York.
- 14
15
16 659 Chen, I.C., Shiu, H.J., Benedick, S., Holloway, J.D., Chey, V.K., Barlow, H.S., Hill,
17
18 660 J.K. & Thomas, C.D. (2009) Elevation increases in moth assemblages over 42 years on
19
20 661 a tropical mountain. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, **106**, 1479-1483.
- 21
22
23 662 Cicero, J.M. (1988) Ontophylogenetics of cantharoid larviforms (Coleoptera:
24
25 663 Cantharoidea). *The Coleopterists' Bulletin*, **42**, 105-151.
- 26
27
28 664 Cirelli, K.R.N. & Penteado-Dias, A.M. (2003) Análise da riqueza da fauna de
29
30 665 Braconidae (Hymenoptera, Ichneumonoidea) em remanescentes naturais da Área de
31
32 666 Proteção Ambiental (APA) de Descalvado, SP. *Revista Brasileira de Entomologia*, **47**,
33
34 667 89-98.
- 35
36
37 668 Colwell, R.K., Brehm, G., Cardelus, C., Gilman, A. & Longino, J. (2008) Global
38
39 669 warming, elevational range shifts, and lowland biotic attrition in the wet tropics.
40
41 670 *Science*, **322**, 258-261.
- 42
43
44 671 Coyne, J.A. & Orr, H.A. (2004). *Speciation*, Sinauer, Sunderland MA.
- 45
46
47 672 da Silva, J.M.C. & Casteleti, C.H.M. (2003) Status of the biodiversity of the Atlantic
48
49 673 Forest of Brazil. *The Atlantic Forest of South America: Biodiversity Status, Threats, and*
50
51 674 *Outlook*. CABS and Island Press, Washington, DC.
- 52
53
54 675 Daly, H.V., Doyen, J.T. & Purcell III, A.H. (1998) *Introduction to Insect Biology and*
55
56 676 *Diversity*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK.
- 57
58
59 677 Diniz-Filho, J.A.F., De Marco Jr,P., & Hawkins, B.A. (2010) Defying the curse of
60
ignorance: perspectives in insect macroecology and conservation biogeography. *Insect
Conservation and Diversity*, **3**, 172-179.

- 1
2
3 680 Feeley K.J. & Silman M.R. (2010) Biotic attrition from tropical forests correcting for
4 truncated temperature niches. *Global Change Biology*, **16**, 1830-1836.
5
6 682 Flinte, V., Macedo, M.V. & Monteiro, R.F. (2009) Chrysomelids and their host plants
7 along an altitudinal gradient in a tropical Atlantic Rain Forest in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil.
8 684 *Research on Chrysomelidae, vol 2.*, (ed. by Jolivet, P., Santiago-Blay, J. & Schmidt,
9 685 M.), pp. 31-56, Brill, Leiden.
10
11 686 Forero-Medina, G., Terborgh J., Socolar S.J. & Pimm, S.L. (2011) Elevational ranges of
12 birds on a tropical montane gradient lag behind warming temperatures. *PlosOne*, **6**,
13 688 e28535.
14
15 689 Fraser, S.E.M., Dytham, C. & Mayhew, P.J. (2007) Determinants of parasitoid
16 abundance and diversity in woodland habitats. *Journal of Applied Ecology*, **44**, 352–
17 691 361.
18
19 692 García-Robledo, C., Kuprewicz, E.K., Staines, C.L., Erwin, T.L. & Kress, W.J. (2016)
20 Limited tolerance by insects to high temperatures across tropical elevational gradients
21 and the implications of global warming for extinction. *Proceedings of the National
22 Academy of Sciences*, **113**, 680-685.
23
24 696 Gaston K.J. & Chown S.L. (1999) Elevation and climatic tolerance: A test using dung
25 beetles. *Oikos*, **86**, 584-590.
26
27 698 Ghalambor, C. K., Huey, R.B., Martin, P.R., Tewksbury, J.J. & Wang, G. (2006) Are
28 mountain passes higher in the tropics? Janzen's hypothesis revisited. *Integrative and
29 Comparative Biology*, **46**, 5-17.
30
31 701 Hannah, L. (2012) *Saving a million species: extinction risk from climate change*. Island
32 Press, Washington DC.
33
34 703 Huey, R.B. (1976) Latitudinal pattern of between-altitude faunal similarity: mountains
35 might be “higher” in the tropics. *American Naturalist*, **112**, 225-254.
36
37 705 Huey, R.B., Kearney, M.R., Krockenberger, A., Holthum, J.A.M., Jess, M. & Williams,
38 706 S.E. (2012) Predicting organismal vulnerability to climate warming: roles of behaviour,
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 707 physiology and adaptation. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B*, **367**,
4 708 1665-1679.
5
6
7 709 Janzen, D.H. (1967) Why mountain passes are higher in the tropics. *The American
8 Naturalist*, **101**, 233-249.
9
10
11 711 Jolivet, P., & Hawkeswood, T. (1995) *Host-plants of Chrysomelidae of the world: an
12 essay about the relationships between leaf beetles and their food-plants*. Backhuys
13 Publishers, Leiden.
14
15
16 714 Konvicka, M., Maradova, M., Benes, J., Fri, Z. & Kepka, P. (2003) Uphill shifts in
17 distribution of butterflies in the Czech Republic: effects of changing climate detected on
18 a regional scale. *Global Ecology & Biogeography*, **12**, 403-410
19
20
21
22
23
24 717 La Sorte, F.A. & Jetz, W. (2010) Projected range contractions of montane biodiversity
25 under global warming, *Proceedings of the Royal Society B-Biological Sciences*, **277**,
26 719 3401-3410.
27
28
29
30 720 La Sorte, F.A., Butchart, S.H.M., Jetz, W. & Böhning-Gaese, K. (2014) Range-wide
31 latitudinal and elevational temperature gradients for the world's terrestrial birds:
32 implications under global climate change. *PlosOne*, **9**, e98361.
33
34
35
36 723 Larsen, N.J., Minor, M.A., Cruickshank, R.H. & Robertson, A.W. (2014) Optimising
37 methods for collecting Hymenoptera, including parasitoids and Halictidae bees, in New
38 Zealand apple orchards. *Journal of Asia-Pacific Entomology*, **17**, 375-81.
39
40
41
42 726 Laurance, W.F., Useche, D.C., Shoo, L.P., Herzog, S.K., Kessler, M., Escobar, F., *et al.*
43 727 (2011). Global warming, elevational ranges and the vulnerability of tropical biota.
44 728 *Biological Conservation*, **144**, 548-557.
45
46
47
48 729 Lewis, S. M., & Cratsley, C. K. (2008). Flash signal evolution, mate choice, and
49 predation in fireflies. *Annual Review of Entomology*, **53**, 293-321.
50
51
52
53 731 Macedo, M.V., Flinte, V., Araujo, C.O., Silveira L.F.L., Bouzan, A.M., Dufrayer, R.,
54 732 Viana, J.H., Araujo, R.O., Hentz, E. & Monteiro, R.F. (2016) Elevational ranges and
55 local extinction risk of beetles occurring in the “Campos de Altitude” in southeastern
56 Brazil. *Oecologia Australis*, **20**, 121-132.
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 735 Magurran, A.E., & May, R.M. (Eds.) (1999) *Evolution of biological diversity*. Oxford
4
5 736 University Press, Oxford, UK.
6
7
8 737 McCain, C.M. (2009) Vertebrate range sizes indicate that mountains may be 'higher' in
9 the tropics. *Ecology Letters*, **12**, 550-560.
10
11
12 739 Mekasha, A., Nigatu, L., Tesfaye, K. & Duncan, A.J. (2013) Modeling the response of
13 tropical highland herbaceous grassland species to climate change: The case of the Arsi
14
15 741 Mountains of Ethiopia. *Biological Conservation*, **168**, 169-175.
16
17
18 742 Merrill, R.M., Gutiérrez, D., Lewis, O.T., Gutiérrez, J., Díez, S.B. & Wilson, R.J.
19
20 (2008). Combined effects of climate and biotic interactions on the elevational range of a
21 phytophagous insect. *Journal of Animal Ecology*, **77**, 145-155.
22
23
24 745 Mittermeier, R.A., Myers, N., Robles, G.P., & Mittermeier, C.C. (1999) Hotspots
25
26 Agrupación Sierra Madre. *CEMEX, Mexico City*.
27
28
29 747 Morellato, L.P.C., & Haddad, C.F. (2000) Introduction: The Brazilian Atlantic Forest.
30
31 748 *Biotropica*, **32**, 786-792.
32
33
34 749 Myers, N., Mittermeier, R.A., Mittermeier, C.G., Da Fonseca, G.A. & Kent, J. (2000)
35 Biodiversity hotspots for conservation priorities. *Nature*, **403**, 853-858.
36
37
38 751 Nieto-Sanchez, S., Gutierrez, D. & Wilson, R.J. (2015) Long-term change and spatial
39 variation in butterfly communities over an elevational gradient: driven by climate,
40
41 buffered by habitat. *Diversity and Distributions*, **21**, 950-961.
42
43
44 754 Nosil, P. (2012) *Ecological speciation*. Oxford University Press, Oxford. UK.
45
46
47 755 Novotny, V. & Basset, Y. (2005) Host specificity of insect herbivores in tropical
48 forests. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London B: Biological Sciences*, **272**, 1083-
49
50 1090.
51
52
53 758 Ohsawa, M. (2010) Beetle families as indicators of Coleopteran diversity in forests: a
54 study using Malaise traps in the central mountainous region of Japan. *Journal of Insect
55 Conservation*, **14**, 479-84.
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 761 Parmesan, C. & Yohe G. (2003) A globally coherent fingerprint of climate change
4 impacts across natural systems *Nature*, **421**, 37-42.
5
6
7 763 Parmesan, C. (2006) Ecological and evolutionary responses to recent climate change.
8 764 *Annual Review of Ecology Evolution and Systematics*, **37**, 637-669.
9
10
11 765 Pounds, J.A., Bustamente, M., Coloma, L., Consuegra, J., Fogden, M., Foster, P., La
12 Marca, E., Masters, K., Merino-Viteri, A., Puschendorf, R., Ron, S., Sanchez-Azofeifa,
13
14 767 A., Still, C. & Young, B. (2006) Widespread amphibian extinctions from epidemic
15 disease driven by global warming. *Nature*, **439**, 161-167.
16
17
18
19 769 R-Core-Team (2015) R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing (R
20 Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna). Available at <https://www.R-project.org>. Accessed November, 2015.
21
22
23
24
25 772 Rank, N. E. (1992) A hierarchical analysis of genetic differentiation in a montane leaf
26 beetles *Chrysomela aeneicollis* (Coleoptera: Chrysomelidae). *Evolution*, **46**, 1097-1111.
27
28
29
30 774 Ribeiro, M.C., Metzger, J.P., Martensen, A.C., Ponzoni, F.J. & Hirota, M.M. (2009)
31 The Brazilian Atlantic Forest: How much is left, and how is the remaining forest
32
33 776 distributed? Implications for conservation. *Biological Conservation*, **142**, 1141-1153.
34
35
36 777 Rizzini, C.T. (1954) Flora Organensis: lista preliminar das Cormophyta da Serra dos
37
38 Órgãos. Volume XIII. *Arquivos do Jardim Botânico do Rio de Janeiro*, **13**, 115-259.
39
40
41 779 Safford, H.D. (1999) Brazilian Páramos I. An introduction to the physical environment
42 and vegetation of the Campos de altitude. *Journal of Biogeography*, **26**, 693-712.
43
44
45 781 Schlüter, D. (2000) *The Ecology of Adaptive Radiation*. Oxford University Press,
46
47 Oxford.
48
49
50 783 Sekercioglu, C.H., Schneider, S., Fay, J. & Loarie, S. 2008. Climate change, elevational
51 range shifts, and bird extinctions. *Conservation Biology*, **22**, 140-150.
52
53
54 785 Shaw, M.R. & Huddleston, T. (1991) Classification and biology of braconid wasps.
55 786 *Handbooks for the identification of British insects*, **7**, 126pp.
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 787 Silva, P.D., Vaz-de-Mello, F.Z., Di Mare, R.A. (2012) Attractiveness of different bait to
4 the Scarabaeinae (Coleoptera: Scarabaeidae) in forest fragments in extreme southern
5 Brazil. *Zoological Studies*, **51**, 429-41.
6
7
8 790 Silveira, L., Khattar, G., Souto, P., Mermudes, J.R.M., Takiya, D.M., & Monteiro, R.F.
9 (2016) Integrative taxonomy of new firefly taxa from the Atlantic Rainforest.
10
11 792 *Systematics and Biodiversity*, **14**, 371-384.
12
13
14 793 South, A., Stanger-Hall, K., Jeng, M.L., & Lewis, S.M. (2011) Correlated evolution of
15 female neoteny and flightlessness with male spermatophore production in fireflies
16 (Coleoptera: Lampyridae). *Evolution*, **65**, 1099-1113.
17
18
19
20
21 796 Southwood, T.R.E. (1978) *Ecological Methods*. Chapman & Hall, New York.
22
23
24 797 Steinbauer, M.J., Field, R., Grytnes, J.A., Trigas, P., Ah-Peng, C., Attorre, F., ... & De
25
26 798 Sanctis, M. (2016) Topography-driven isolation, speciation and a global increase of
27 endemism with elevation. *Global Ecology and Biogeography*, **25**, 1097-1107.
28
29
30 800 Stevens, G.C. (1992) The elevational gradient in altitudinal range: an extension of
31
32 801 Rapoport's latitudinal rule to altitude. *The American Naturalist*, **140**, 893-911.
33
34
35 802 Stiling, P. 2004. Biological control not on target. *Biological Invasions*, **6**, 151-159.
36
37
38 803 Telwala, Y., Brook, B.W., Manish, K. & Pandit, M.K. (2013) Climate-induced
39 elevational range shifts and increase in plant species richness in a himalayan
40 biodiversity epicentre. *PlosOne*, **8**, e57103.
41
42
43
44 806 Thomas, C.D., Cameron, A., Green, R.E., Bakkenes, M., Beaumont, L.J., Collingham,
45
46 807 Y.C., Erasmus, B.F., De Siqueira, M.F., Grainger, A., Hannah, L., Hughes, L., Huntley,
47
48 808 B., Van Jaarsveld, A.S., Midgley, G.F., Miles, L., Ortega-Huerta, M.A., Peterson, A.T.,
49
50 809 Phillips, O.L. & Williams, S.E. (2004) Extinction risk from climate change. *Nature*,
51
52 810 **427**, 145-148.
53
54
55 811 Thomson, L.J., Neville, P.J. & Hoffmann, A.A. (2004) Effective trapping methods for
56 assessing invertebrates in vineyards. *Australian Journal of Experimental Agriculture*,
57
58 813 **44**, 947-53.
59
60

1
2
3 814 Urban, M.C. (2015) Accelerating extinction risk from climate change. *Science*, **348**,
4 815 571-573.
5
6

7 816 Veloso, H.P., Rangel Filho, A.L.R. & Lima, J.C.A. (1991) *Classificação da vegetação*
8 817 *brasileira, adaptada a um sistema universal*. Fundação Instituto Brasileiro de Geografia
9 e Estatística, Departamento de Recursos Naturais e Estudos Ambientais, Rio de Janeiro,
10 818 Brasil.
11
12

13
14 820 Voigt, W., Perner, J., Davis, A.J., Eggers, T., Schumacher, J., Bährmann, R., Fabian, B.,
15 Heinrich, W., Köhler, G., Lichter, D., Marstaller, R. & Sander, F.W. (2003) Trophic
16 levels are differentially sensitive to climate. *Ecology*, **84**, 2444–2453.
17
18

19
20 823 Wilson, R.D., Trueman, J.W.H., Williams, S.E. & Yeates, D.K. (2007) Altitudinally
21 restricted communities of schizophoran flies in Queensland's wet tropics: vulnerability
22 to climate change. *Biodiversity and Conservation*, **16**, 3163-3177.
23
24

25
26 826 Zarnetske, P.L., Skelly, D.K. & Urban, m C. (2012) Biotic multipliers of climate change.
27 *Science*, **336**, 1516-1518.
28
29

30
31 828 Zografou, K., Kati, V., Grill, A., Wilson, R.J., Tzirkalli, E., Pamperis, L.N., & Halley,
32 829 J.M. (2014) Signals of climate change in butterfly communities in a Mediterranean
33 830 protected area. *PlosOne*, **9**, e87245.
34
35

36 831
37
38

39 832
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 833 Table 1. Observed and asymptotic estimates of species richness (\pm SE) for the different
4 834 taxa and sampling designs.
5
6
7
8
9

Taxon	Sample design	Observed richness	Chao 1 richness	ACE richness
All	two-zone	697	1193.50 ± 75.53	1227.61 ± 20.52
All	four-zone	156	174.45 ± 9.05	179.00 ± 6.67
Braconidae	two-zone	174	303.33 ± 35.75	355.23 ± 11.64
Chrysomelidae	two-zone	263	452.02 ± 46.82	452.85 ± 12.58
Coccinellidae	two-zone	27	28.00 ± 1.58	29.40 ± 2.56
Curculionidae	two-zone	137	284.27 ± 46.61	309.78 ± 11.47
Lampyridae	two-zone	48	61.13 ± 9.01	64.43 ± 4.03
Scarabaeinae	two-zone	26	36.50 ± 10.52	31.30 ± 2.72
Tiphidae	two-zone	22	23.00 ± 2.31	22.76 ± 2.29
Eumolpinae	four-zone	56	65.55 ± 6.56	70.33 ± 4.45
Lampyridae	four-zone	65	67.80 ± 2.83	69.92 ± 4.12
Scarabaeinae	four-zone	35	40.00 ± 5.52	39.22 ± 3.11

39 835

40 836

41 837

1
2
3 838 Figure 1. Study location a) with the Serra dos Órgãos National Park (shaded area) and
4 839 views of the four vegetation zones studied. b) Lower Montane Forest c) Montane Forest
5 840 d) Upper Montane Forest e) Campos de Altitude.
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14

15
16 841 Figure 2. Location of the sampling transect route showing the different elevation zones:
17 842 for the two-zones analysis, A-D = lower-zone; E-H = upper zone. For the four-zones
18 843 analysis, A-B = lower montane; C-D = montane; E-F = upper montane; G-H = Campos
19 844 de Altitude.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

29 845 Figure 3. Rarefaction curves (mean \pm 95% CI) for all taxa in (a) the two-zones dataset
30 846 and (b) the four-zones dataset.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 847 Figure 4. Specialization to upper and lower elevational zones. a) across all species
40 848 collected in the different taxonomic groups and b) only including species in which >4
41 849 individuals were collected. The lower zone was 350m to 1280m and upper-zone 1450m
42 850 to 2170 m. Asterisk above bar indicates significant difference using Pearson's χ^2 test (P
43 851 < 0.05). Specialists are species which are only found in one of the zones.
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

53 852 Figure 5. Taxonomic differences in specialization to upper or lower elevation zones. a)
54 853 across all species collected in the different taxonomic groups and b) only including
55 854 species in which >4 individuals were collected. The lower zone was 350m to 1280m
56 855 and upper-zone 1450m to 2170 m. Different letters above bars indicate significant
57 856 differences among groups using Pearson's χ^2 test (FDR correction χ^2 , $P < 0.05$).
58 Specialists are species which are only found in one of the zones.
59
60

61 858 Figure 6. Elevational range against log abundance across species. Data are jittered
62 859 slightly vertically to aid visibility although species are all either found in one zone or
63 860 two in the two-zones analysis (a, b) or 1-4 in the four-zones analysis (c). Predicted
64 861 values from logistic regressions show different taxa (a & c) or trophic groups (b). Brac
65 862 = Braconidae Chry = Chrysomelidae, Cocc = Coccinellidae, Curc = Curculionidae;;
66 863 Eumol = Eumolpinae, Lamp = Lampyridae, Scara = Scarabaeinae, Tiph = Tiphidae,
67 864 Herb = Herbivores, Para = Parasitoids, Pred = Predators, Sapro = Saprotrophs.
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
5510
5511
5512
5513
5514
5515
5516
5517
5518
5519
5520
5521
5522
5523
5524
5525
5526
5527
5528
5529
5530
5531
5532
5533
5534
5535
5536
5537
5538
5539
5540
5541
5542
5543
5544
5545
5546
5547
5548
5549
5550
5551
5552
5553
5554
5555
5556
5557
5558
5559
55510
55511
55512
55513
55514
55515
55516
55517
55518
55519
55520
55521
55522
55523
55524
55525
55526
55527
55528
55529
55530
55531
55532
55533
55534
55535
55536
55537
55538
55539
55540
55541
55542
55543
55544
55545
55546
55547
55548
55549
55550
55551
55552
55553
55554
55555
55556
55557
55558
55559
55560
55561
55562
55563
55564
55565
55566
55567
55568
55569
55570
55571
55572
55573
55574
55575
55576
55577
55578
55579
55580
55581
55582
55583
55584
55585
55586
55587
55588
55589
55590
55591
55592
55593
55594
55595
55596
55597
55598
55599
555100
555101
555102
555103
555104
555105
555106
555107
555108
555109
555110
555111
555112
555113
555114
555115
555116
555117
555118
555119
555120
555121
555122
555123
555124
555125
555126
555127
555128
555129
555130
555131
555132
555133
555134
555135
555136
555137
555138
555139
555140
555141
555142
555143
555144
555145
555146
555147
555148
555149
555150
555151
555152
555153
555154
555155
555156
555157
555158
555159
555160
555161
555162
555163
555164
555165
555166
555167
555168
555169
555170
555171
555172
555173
555174
555175
555176
555177
555178
555179
555180
555181
555182
555183
555184
555185
555186
555187
555188
555189
555190
555191
555192
555193
555194
555195
555196
555197
555198
555199
555200
555201
555202
555203
555204
555205
555206
555207
555208
555209
555210
555211
555212
555213
555214
555215
555216
555217
555218
555219
555220
555221
555222
555223
555224
555225
555226
555227
555228
555229
555230
555231
555232
555233
555234
555235
555236
555237
555238
555239
555240
555241
555242
555243
555244
555245
555246
555247
555248
555249
555250
555251
555252
555253
555254
555255
555256
555257
555258
555259
555260
555261
555262
555263
555264
555265
555266
555267
555268
555269
555270
555271
555272
555273
555274
555275
555276
555277
555278
555279
555280
555281
555282
555283
555284
555285
555286
555287
555288
555289
555290
555291
555292
555293
555294
555295
555296
555297
555298
555299
555300
555301
555302
555303
555304
555305
555306
555307
555308
555309
555310
555311
555312
555313
555314
555315
555316
555317
555318
555319
555320
555321
555322
555323
555324
555325
555326
555327
555328
555329
555330
555331
555332
555333
555334
555335
555336
555337
555338
555339
555340
555341
555342
555343
555344
555345
555346
555347
555348
555349
555350
555351
555352
555353
555354
555355
555356
555357
555358
555359
555360
555361
555362
555363
555364
555365
555366
555367
555368
555369
555370
555371
555372
555373
555374
555375
555376
555377
555378
555379
555380
555381
555382
555383
555384
555385
555386
555387
555388
555389
555390
555391
555392
555393
555394
555395
555396
555397
555398
555399
555400
555401
555402
555403
555404
555405
555406
555407
555408
555409
555410
555411
555412
555413
555414
555415
555416
555417
555418
555419
555420
555421
555422
555423
555424
555425
555426
555427
555428
555429
555430
555431
555432
555433
555434
555435
555436
555437
555438
555439
555440
555441
555442
555443
555444
555445
555446
555447
555448
555449
555450
555451
555452
555453
555454
555455
555456
555457
555458
555459
555460
555461
555462
555463
555464
555465
555466
555467
555468
555469
555470
555471
555472
555473
555474
555475
555476
555477
555478
555479
555480
555481
555482
555483
555484
555485
555486
555487
555488
555489
555490
555491
555492
555493
555494
555495
555496
555497
555498
555499
555500
555501
555502
555503
555504
555505
555506
555507
555508
555509
555510
555511
555512
555513
555514
555515
555516
555517
555518
555519
555520
555521
555522
555523
555524
555525
555526
555527
555528
555529
555530
555531
555532
555533
555534
555535
555536
555537
555538
555539
555540
555541
555542
555543
555544
555545
555546
555547
555548
555549
555550
555551
555552
555553
555554
555555
555556
555557
555558
555559
555560
555561
555562
555563
555564
555565
555566
555567
555568
555569
555570
555571
555572
555573
555574
555575
555576
555577
555578
555579
555580
555581
555582
555583
555584
555585
555586
555587
555588
555589
555590
555591
555592
555593
555594
555595
555596
555597
555598
555599
5555100
5555101
5555102
5555103
5555104
5555105
5555106
5555107
5555108
5555109
5555110
5555111
5555112
5555113
5555114
5555115
5555116
5555117
5555118
5555119
5555120
5555121
5555122
5555123
5555124
5555125
5555126
5555127
5555128
5555129
5555130
5555131
5555132
5555133
5555134
5555135
5555136
5555137
5555138
5555139
5555140
5555141
5555142
5555143
5555144
5555145
5555146
5555147
5555148
5555149
5555150
5555151
5555152
5555153
5555154
5555155
5555156
5555157
5555158
5555159
5555160
5555161
5555162
5555163
5555164
5555165
5555166
5555167
5555168
5555169
5555170
5555171
5555172
5555173
5555174
5555175
5555176
5555177
5555178
5555179
5555180
5555181
5555182
5555183
5555184
5555185
5555186
5555187
5555188
5555189
5555190
5555191
5555192
5555193
5555194
5555195
5555196
5555197
5555198
5555199
5555200
5555201
5555202
5555203
5555204
5555205
5555206
5555207
5555208
5555209
5555210
5555211
5555212
5555213
5555214
5555215
5555216
5555217
5555218
5555219
5555220
5555221
5555222
5555223
5555224
5555225
5555226
5555227
5555228
5555229
5555230
5555231
5555232
5555233
5555234
5555235
5555236
5555237
5555238
5555239
5555240
5555241
5555242
5555243
5555244
5555245
5555246
5555247
5555248
5555249
5555250
5555251
5555252
5555253
5555254
5555255
5555256
5555257
5555258
5555259
5555260
5555261
5555262
5555263
5555264
5555265
5555266
5555267
5555268
5555269
5555270
5555271
5555272
5555273
5555274
5555275
5555276
5555277
5555278
5555279
5555280
5555281
5555282
5555283
5555284
5555285
5555286
5555287
5555288
5555289
5555290
5555291
5555292
5555293
5555294
5555295
5555296
5555297
5555298
5555299
5555300
5555301
5555302
5555303
5555304
5555305
5555306
5555307
5555308
5555309
5555310
5555311
5555312
5555313
5555314
5555315
5555316
5555317
5555318
5555319
5555320
5555321
5555322
5555323
5555324
5555325
5555326
5555327
5555328
5555329
5555330
5555331
5555332
5555333
5555334
5555335
5555336
5555337
5555338
5555339
5555340
5555341
5555342
5555343
5555344
5555345
5555346
5555347
5555348
5555349
5555350
5555351
5555352
5555353
5555354
5555355
5555356
5555357
5555358
5555359
5555360
5555361
5555362
5555363
5555364
5555365
5555366
5555367
5555368
5555369
5555370
5555371
5555372
5555373
5555374
5555375
5555376
5555377
5555378
5555379
5555380
5555381
5555382
5555383
5555384
5555385
5555386
5555387
5555388
5555389
5555390
5555391
5555392
5555393
5555394
5555395
5555396
5555397
5555398
5555399
5555400
5555401
5555402
5555403
5555404
5555405
5555406
5555407
55

1
2
3 868 groups using Pearson's χ^2 test (FDR correction χ^2 , $P < 0.05$). Specialists are species
4 869 which are only found in one of the zones.
5
6

7 870 **Figure 8.** Taxonomic differences in specialization across four vegetational zones. a)
8 871 across all species collected in the different taxonomic groups and b) only including
9 872 species in which >4 individuals were collected. Different letters above bars indicate
10 873 significant differences among groups using Pearson's χ^2 test (FDR correction χ^2 , $P <$
11 874 0.05). Specialists are species which are only found in one of the zones.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For Review Only




Figure 1. Study location a) with the Serra dos Órgãos National Park (shaded area) and views of the four vegetation zones studied. b) Lower Montane Forest c) Montane Forest d) Upper Montane Forest e) Campos de Altitude.

226x248mm (300 x 300 DPI)




Figure 2. Location of the sampling transect route showing the different elevation zones: for the two-zones analysis, A-D = lower-zone; E-H = upper zone. For the four-zones analysis, A-B = lower montane; C-D = montane; E-F = upper montane; G-H = Campos de Altitude.

478x346mm (300 x 300 DPI)




Figure 3. Rarefaction curves (mean \pm 95% CI) for all taxa in (a) the two-zones dataset and (b) the four-zones dataset.

151x222mm (300 x 300 DPI)




Figure 4. Specialization to upper and lower elevational zones. a) across all species collected in the different taxonomic groups and b) only including species in which >4 individuals were collected. The lower zone was 350m to 1280m and upper-zone 1450m to 2170 m. Asterisk above bar indicates significant difference using Pearson's χ^2 test ($P < 0.05$). Specialists are species which are only found in one of the zones.

283x427mm (300 x 300 DPI)




Figure 5. Taxonomic differences in specialization to upper or lower elevation zones. a) across all species collected in the different taxonomic groups and b) only including species in which >4 individuals were collected. The lower zone was 350m to 1280m and upper-zone 1450m to 2170 m. Different letters above bars indicate significant differences among groups using Pearson's χ^2 test (FDR correction χ^2 , $P < 0.05$). Specialists are species which are only found in one of the zones.

283x425mm (300 x 300 DPI)




Figure 6. Elevational range against log abundance across species. Data are jittered slightly vertically to aid visibility although species are all either found in one zone or two in the two-zones analysis (a, b) or 1-4 in the four-zones analysis (c). Predicted values from logistic regressions show different taxa (a & c) or trophic groups (b). Brac = Braconidae Chry = Chrysomelidae, Cocc = Coccinellidae, Curc = Curculionidae;; Eumol = Eumolpinae, Lamp = Lampyridae, Scara = Scarabaeinae, Tiph = Tiphidae, Herb = Herbivores, Para = Parasitoids, Pred = Predators, Sapro = Saprotrophs.

159x256mm (300 x 300 DPI)




Figure 7. Specialization across four vegetational zones. a) across all species collected in the different taxonomic groups and b) only including species in which >4 individuals were collected. Different letters above bars indicate significant differences among groups using Pearson's χ^2 test (FDR correction χ^2 , $P < 0.05$). Specialists are species which are only found in one of the zones.

285x434mm (300 x 300 DPI)




Figure 8. Taxonomic differences in specialization across four vegetational zones. a) across all species collected in the different taxonomic groups and b) only including species in which >4 individuals were collected. Different letters above bars indicate significant differences among groups using Pearson's χ^2 test (FDR correction χ^2 , $P < 0.05$). Specialists are species which are only found in one of the zones.

286x438mm (300 x 300 DPI)