Naturalis Biodiversity Center

Naturalis Repository

Floral specialization for different pollinators and divergent use of the same pollinator among co-occurring Impatiens species (Balsaminaceae) from Southeast Asia

Saroj Ruchisansakun , Pornpimon Tangtorwongsakul , Ruth J. Cozien , Erik F. Smets , Timotheüs van der Niet

Downloaded from:
https://doi.org/10.1111/boj.12427

Article 25fa Dutch Copyright Act (DCA) - End User Rights

This publication is distributed under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act (Auteurswet) with consent from the author. Dutch law entitles the maker of a short scientific work funded either wholly or partially by Dutch public funds to make that work publicly available following a reasonable period after the work was first published, provided that reference is made to the source of the first publication of the work.

This publication is distributed under the Naturalis Biodiversity Center 'Taverne implementation' programme. In this programme, research output of Naturalis researchers and collection managers that complies with the legal requirements of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act is distributed online and free of barriers in the Naturalis institutional repository. Research output is distributed six months after its first online publication in the original published version and with proper attribution to the source of the original publication.

You are permitted to download and use the publication for personal purposes. All rights remain with the author(s) and copyrights owner(s) of this work. Any use of the publication other than authorized under this license or copyright law is prohibited.

If you believe that digital publication of certain material infringes any of your rights or (privacy) interests, please let the department of Collection Information know, stating your reasons. In case of a legitimate complaint, Collection Information will make the material inaccessible. Please contact us through email: collectie.informatie@naturalis.nl. We will contact you as soon as possible.

The LINNEAN SOCIETY of London BOTANICAL Journal of the Linnean Society

Botanical Journal of the Linnean Society, 2016, **181**, 651–666. With 6 figures

Floral specialization for different pollinators and divergent use of the same pollinator among co-occurring *Impatiens* species (Balsaminaceae) from Southeast Asia

SAROJ RUCHISANSAKUN[1,2], PORNPIMON TANGTORWONGSAKUL[3], RUTH J. COZIEN[1,4], ERIK F. SMETS FMLS[1,2,5] and TIMOTHEÜS VAN DER NIET[1,2,4]*

[1]*Naturalis Biodiversity Center, PO Box 9517, 2300 RA Leiden, the Netherlands*
[2]*Leiden University, PO Box 9517, 2300 RA Leiden, the Netherlands*
[3]*King Mongkut's University of Technology Thonburi, 83 Moo 8, Takham, Bangkhuntien, 10150, Bangkok, Thailand*
[4]*School of Life Sciences, University of KwaZulu-Natal, P. Bag X01, 3209 Scottsville, South Africa*
[5]*Section Ecology, Evolution and Biodiversity Conservation, KU Leuven, BE-3001 Leuven, Belgium*

Received 21 November 2015; revised 8 February 2016; accepted for publication 21 March 2016

Floral variation among closely related species is thought to often reflect differences in pollination systems. Flowers of the large genus *Impatiens* are characterized by extensive variation in colour, shape and size and in anther and stigma positioning, but studies of their pollination ecology are scarce and most lack a comparative context. Consequently, the function of floral diversity in *Impatiens* remains enigmatic. This study documents floral variation and pollination of seven co-occurring *Impatiens* spp. in the Southeast Asian diversity hotspot. To assess whether floral trait variation reflects specialization for different pollination systems, we tested whether species depend on pollinators for reproduction, identified animals that visit flowers, determined whether these visitors play a role in pollination and quantified and compared key floral traits, including floral dimensions and nectar characteristics. Experimental exclusion of insects decreased fruit and seed set significantly for all species except *I. muscicola*, which also received almost no visits from animals. Most species received visits from several animals, including bees, birds, butterflies and hawkmoths, only a subset of which were effective pollinators. *Impatiens psittacina*, *I. kerriae*, *I. racemosa* and *I. daraneenae* were pollinated by bees, primarily *Bombus haemorrhoidalis*. *Impatiens chiangdaoensis* and *I. santisukii* had bimodal pollination systems which combined bee and lepidopteran pollination. Floral traits differed significantly among species with different pollination systems. Autogamous flowers were small and spurless, and did not produce nectar; bee-pollinated flowers had short spurs and large floral chambers with a wide entrance; and bimodally bee- and lepidopteran-pollinated species had long spurs and a small floral chamber with a narrow entrance. Nectar-producing species with different pollination systems did not differ in nectar volume and sugar concentration. Despite the high frequency of bee pollination in co-occurring species, individuals with a morphology suggestive of hybrid origin were rare. Variation in floral architecture, including various forms of corolla asymmetry, facilitates distinct, species-specific pollen-placement on visiting bees. Our results show that floral morphological diversity among *Impatiens* spp. is associated with both differences in functional pollinator groups and divergent use of the same pollinator. Non-homologous mechanisms of floral asymmetry are consistent with repeated independent evolution, suggesting that competitive interactions among species with the same pollination system have been an important driver of floral variation among *Impatiens* spp. © 2016 The Linnean Society of London, *Botanical Journal of the Linnean Society*, 2016, **181**, 651–666

ADDITIONAL KEYWORDS: autogamy – bee pollination – butterfly pollination – floral asymmetry – nectar robbing – nectar spur – pollen placement – sympatry – tropics.

*Corresponding author. E-mail: vdniet@gmail.com

INTRODUCTION

Diversity in traits among angiosperm flowers has frequently been explained in the context of plant–pollinator interactions (Darwin, 1862). In particular, repeated broad-scale similarities in floral traits among distantly related plant species have been interpreted as evidence for widespread specialization for different functional pollinator groups (Vogel, 1954; Faegri & van der Pijl, 1979; Fenster *et al.*, 2004). However, evidence from studies that have quantified floral visitation by animals has suggested that plant species thought to be specialized for a particular functional pollinator group are often visited by a suite of animals representing multiple functional groups (Waser *et al.*, 1996) or by representatives from a different functional pollinator group than implied by floral traits (e.g. Fishbein & Venable, 1996; Mayfield, Waser & Price, 2001). Furthermore, evidence has accumulated that floral traits also perform functions that are unrelated to pollination, such as mediating interactions between plants and herbivores or the abiotic environment (e.g. Strauss & Whittall, 2006; Wang *et al.*, 2013; De Jager & Ellis, 2014). Hence, confirmation of the link between floral diversity and specialization for different functional pollinator groups requires a combination of analyses of floral traits and detailed observations to distinguish visitors and pollinators.

Associations between floral diversity and specialized pollination may differ geographically (Johnson & Steiner, 2003; Pauw & Stanway, 2015). For example, in temperate floras, environmental perturbations during glacial cycles might have favoured generalized plant–pollinator interactions, whereas in tropical regions, relatively stable climates might allow for persistence of highly specialized biotic interactions (e.g. Schemske *et al.*, 2009; Dalsgaard *et al.*, 2011; but see Schleuning *et al.*, 2012). Furthermore, some researchers have predicted that competitive biotic interactions play an important role in determining high levels of ecological specialization in biodiverse tropical regions at lower latitudes (e.g. Pianka, 1966), although absence of latitudinal trends (Ollerton & Cranmer, 2002) or opposite trends (Schleuning *et al.*, 2012) have also been reported. More research is required to assess whether specialized pollination systems, associated with floral diversity, are common in tropical ecosystems (Ollerton, 2012). The majority of studies addressing the potential link between floral diversity and pollination ecology, however, focus on temperate regions (e.g. Grant & Grant, 1965; Goldblatt & Manning, 2006; Johnson *et al.*, 2011; Valente *et al.*, 2012; Armbruster, Shi & Huang, 2014; Van der Niet *et al.*, 2014) or are mostly limited to the tropics in the New World and Madagascar (e.g. Armbruster & Herzig, 1984; Freitas, Galetto & Sazima, 2006; Smith, Ané & Baum, 2008; Tripp & Manos, 2008).

Impatiens L. (Balsaminaceae) consists of >1000 species distributed mainly in tropical regions of the Old World (Grey-Wilson, 1980; Yuan *et al.*, 2004; Janssens *et al.*, 2009; Yu *et al.*, 2015). The typically unscented flowers vary extensively in shape, colour, presence and length of the spur and nectar properties (Vogel, 1954; Grey-Wilson, 1980; Kato *et al.*, 1991; Janecek, Bartos & Njabo, 2015). Variation in these traits has been shown to be important for mediating specialized interactions with different functional pollinator groups in other plant groups (e.g. Baker & Baker, 1983; Whittall & Hodges, 2007; Van der Niet *et al.*, 2014). A relationship between floral morphology of (predominantly African) *Impatiens* spp. and their pollinator type has been suggested by Vogel (1954) and Grey-Wilson (1980). Although terminology differed, both emphasized variation in sepal, petal and spur morphology and flower colour as being important for identification of distinct flower types pollinated by bees, moths, butterflies and birds, respectively. Grey-Wilson (1980) suggested that 'flat' pale to deep pink flowers with shallow lower sepals, a long spur and a narrow entrance are probably pollinated by butterflies; yellow, white or pale pink funnel-shaped flowers, with deep and wide lower sepals, hood-like dorsal petals (i.e. a wide entrance), and short spurs are probably bee-pollinated; red or orange flowers with a broad entrance would be bird-pollinated; and white funnel-shaped flowers with a long spur are probably moth-pollinated. However, few studies have collected the empirical data required to verify these predictions. Fragmentary evidence suggests that African *Impatiens* spp. with red flowers and trumpet-shaped lower sepals are specialized for sunbird pollination (Bartos & Janecek, 2014; Janecek *et al.*, 2015), whereas most studies performed outside Africa suggest pollination by bees (Rust, 1977; Schemske, 1978; Kato, 1988; Kato *et al.*, 1991; Wilson, 1995; Tian, Liu & Hu, 2004; Sreekala *et al.*, 2008, 2011; Ramasubbu *et al.*, 2011; Mohandass, 2013). Some Asian species, such as *I. reptans* Hook.f. and *I. cuspidata* Wight & Arn., are characterized by relatively generalized pollination systems, including pollination by hawkmoths, bees and butterflies (Tian *et al.*, 2004; Sreekala *et al.*, 2011). Thus, some evidence from observations to date contradicts the hypothesis that variation among *Impatiens* flowers reflects different, specialized pollination systems. Progress in resolving whether floral variation indeed reflects differences in pollination would be aided by studying *Impatiens* spp. in a comparative context, similar to previous studies, for instance, in Iridaceae (Goldblatt & Manning, 2006) and *Aquilegia* L. (Whittall & Hodges, 2007). In particular, comparative

studies that are performed in a restricted area are useful, because these can distinguish specialization due to partitioning of a local pollinator assemblage from apparent specialization due to geographical turnover in pollinator assemblages. The aim of this study was therefore to assess whether floral diversity of seven *Impatiens* spp. from Southeast Asia, which occur in close proximity, is associated with different, specialized pollination systems. We first determined whether plants require animals for pollination. We then observed visitors to identify whether species are specialized for different functional pollinator groups. Finally, we assessed whether similarity in floral characters is associated with similarity in pollination systems.

MATERIAL AND METHODS

Study area and study species

This study was performed on Doi Chiang Dao Mountain in the Chiang Dao Wildlife Sanctuary (*c.* 521 km^2) in the Chiang Mai province of Thailand during November and December 2014. Doi Chiang Dao is the highest limestone mountain in Thailand (elevation 2275 m). Eight *Impatiens* spp. are known from this area; *I. chiangdaoensis* T.Shimizu, *I. daraneenae* Suksathan&Triboun and *I. muscicola* Craib are endemic to the reserve, *I. santisukii* T.Shimizu is endemic to Thailand and *I. discolor* DC., *I. kerriae* Craib, *I. psittacina* Hook.f. and *I. racemosa* DC. have a broader range in Southeast Asia. All species known from the reserve, apart from *I. discolor*, which did not flower due to frost damage, were studied. Six studied species are distributed in lower montane mixed deciduous forest to upper montane scrub, between latitudes 19°22′36.47″N and 19°23′55.77″N, longitudes 98°50′8.78″E and 98°53′30.78″E and 1350–2225 m (Fig. 1), whereas *I. daraneenae* occurs at lower elevations in mixed deciduous forests, around 19°23′44.73″N and 98°46′28.70″E at 768 m, *c.* 6.7 km from the nearest population of the other species (Fig. 1). All species are annual herbs, apart from *I. kerriae*, which is a perennial shrub. Flower longevity is 3 to 4 days for *I. daraneenae*, *I. kerriae*, and *I. psittacina* and 5 to 6 days for *I. chiangdaoensis*, *I. muscicola*, and *I. santisukii* (flower longevity of *I. racemosa* is unknown).




Figure 1. The distribution of studied *Impatiens* spp. in the Chiang Dao Wildlife Sanctuary along a walking trail. Numbers between brackets indicate the number of patches found. Study sites for each species are indicated with squares.

To document whether and which species co-flower, and hence are exposed to the same pollinator assemblage, we recorded the occurrence of flowering populations of all species along a walking trail that includes a cross-section of the habitat types and elevation zones in the reserve. GPS coordinates were recorded for each patch of flowering *Impatiens* spp. throughout the study period from the end of the rainy season to the start of the winter season, during November and December 2014. Whether co-flowering species are exposed to the same pollinator species depends on the maximum flight distances of pollinators. For species included in this study, such data are unavailable. However, given that the most common pollinator in our study was an Asian bumble bee species (recorded for five out of seven species), we used the maximum foraging distance of European bumble bees as a proxy (Wolf & Moritz, 2008). Species were therefore recorded as co-occurring if the distance between patches was < 800 metres.

Visitor exclusion experiment

To test whether plants rely on pollinators for reproduction we performed a visitor exclusion experiment. In one population per species, 7 to 12 (median = 11) plants of each species were selected randomly. On each plant, two buds of similar age, just prior to anthesis, were identified and assigned randomly to an exclusion treatment or an unmanipulated control. The treatment bud was covered with a mesh bag (mesh diameter < 1 mm). After all floral parts apart from the gynoecium were shed, (*c*. 3–4 days) both flowers were bagged to prevent loss of seeds through explosive dispersal. Once flowers had wilted after *c.* 4 weeks, the presence or absence of a fruit capsule was recorded and the number of seeds was counted for all developed fruits. To establish the effect of visitor exclusion on fecundity, fruit and seed set were analysed using generalized linear models with a binomial distribution and logit link function and a negative binomial error structures and log link function, respectively, implemented in SPSS 22 (IBM Corp., Armonk, NY, USA). Means and standard errors were back-transformed from the logit and log scale, respectively, for graphical presentation.

Floral visitor observations

To identify floral visitors, quantify visitation rates and assess the potential role of visitors as pollinators, floral visitors and their behaviour were studied by direct observations. Observations were conducted from half an hour before sunrise until half an hour after sunset, for 2 to 3 days per species in two to four populations in the study area (20–44 h observation for each species, median 37.5 h) (Fig. 1). Flowers of *I. racemosa* in the Chiang Dao Wildlife Sanctuary were already wilting during the study period. Additional visitor observations for this species were therefore performed on 23 November 2014 between 12.00 and 15.00 in a similar habitat in the Doi Inthanon National Park, 18°33′09.3″N 98°28′47.2″E, 2142 m elevation, 120 km from the Chiang Dao Wildlife Sanctuary. All visits to flowers were noted and visitor species were identified to the lowest taxonomic level possible. To determine whether visitors contact plant reproductive parts, visits were photographed and video-recorded using a Canon 60D camera (Tokyo, Japan) and representative visitors were captured with a hand-held insect net, immobilized by anaesthetic ether and checked for the presence of pollen. To summarize visitation rates, visitor species were categorized according to functional groups (cf. Fenster *et al.*, 2004). Animal species representing the same order are expected to functionally resemble each other in perceptional bias and morphology. Potential pollinator specialization is therefore expected to mostly occur at the level of functional groups, rather than at the level of individual animal species (Johnson & Steiner, 2003; Fenster *et al.*, 2004). Following Vogel (1954) and Grey-Wilson (1980), five functional groups were used: bee; bird; butterfly; day-flying hawkmoth; and other (including infrequent visitors of diverse taxonomic origin). Visitation rates for each functional group were calculated by dividing the total number of visits by the total number of hours that a particular *Impatiens* spp. had been observed. To determine the functional pollinator group(s) of each *Impatiens* spp., we excluded visitors that did not contact the anther and stigma. As we could not establish whether day-flying hawkmoths contacted the anther and stigma during visits, we established the broadly defined functional group Lepidoptera for this purpose, to accommodate the possibility that day-flying hawkmoths are effective pollinators besides butterflies.

Floral trait variation

To establish whether floral trait variation is associated with different pollination systems, five key floral traits which are considered to be important for pollination were quantified. For one flower sampled randomly from seven to ten (mean = 7.8) individuals of each species, floral entrance width (gap between lateral united petals), spur length, lower sepal length, lower sepal width and lower sepal height (see Fig. S1 for diagrammatic representation of each character) were measured to the nearest 0.1 mm using Vernier calipers. *Impatiens racemosa* was not

measured due to wilting in the focal population. Flower colour was scored on the basis of visual inspection of flowering plants. Mechanisms of floral asymmetry were described from dissected flowers.

Variation in all measured quantitative characters was visualized using dimension reduction based on principal component analysis (PCA) in the program PAST version 3.02a (Hammer, Harper & Ryan, 2001). We first calculated a variance–covariance matrix based on the quantitative characters and plotted the first two principal components. To test for an association between floral traits and pollination systems, we performed a nested two-way ANOSIM (Clarke, 1993) with species nested in pollination system, defined based on the functional pollinator group(s) of each species (see Results section). ANOSIM is a non-parametric test that evaluates whether dissimilarity in traits within groups is smaller than between two or more groups, based on a distance matrix (Clarke, 1993). Groups were compared based on the Euclidean distance of morphological measurements of species. To calculate significance, samples were randomly assigned to groups 9999 times and the observed dissimilarity was contrasted against the generated distribution of dissimilarity values in Primer Version 6.1.6 (Clarke & Gorley, 2006). To identify which characters contribute most to dissimilarity within and among predefined groups based on pollination systems (see results), we calculated the similarity percentage based on Euclidean distances of morphological characters in a SIMPER analysis (Clarke, 1993) in Primer Version 6.1.6 (Clarke & Gorley, 2006).

Nectar properties were measured from one flower of five to ten individuals (median = 6.5) of each species. To measure the total volume of nectar available for pollinators at anthesis, flowers were bagged before anthesis and nectar volume was measured 1 day after anthesis at 16:00 h. Nectar volume was measured by cutting the tip of the spur and gently squeezing nectar into glass microcapillary tubes [volume 1–5 μL, appropriate for all studied species (Drummond Scientific Company, Broomall, PA, USA)]. Nectar sugar concentration (% w/w) was measured with a handheld refractometer (MASTER-53α Atago, Japan). To assess whether differences in pollination system are associated with differences in nectar properties among the studied *Impatiens* spp., the effect of the predefined pollination systems (fixed factor, see Results) on nectar volume and concentration, respectively, was modelled using REML in the MIXED procedure in SPSS 22 (IBM Inc.). Species nested within pollination system was included as a random factor to account for correlation among measurements of multiple flowers of each species. *Impatiens muscicola*, which does not produce any nectar, was excluded from these analyses.

RESULTS

Visitor exclusion experiment

With the exception of *I. muscicola*, fruit and seed sets were significantly lower for flowers from which animals were excluded compared with unmanipulated control flowers for all species (Fig. 2). In five species, no fruits were developed in any of the flowers from which visiting animals were excluded (Fig. 2).

Floral visitor observations

During 251.5 h of observations, 461 visits to *Impatiens* flowers by 14 different animal species were




Figure 2. Comparison of proportion fruit set (A) and the number of seeds per flower (B) between open-pollinated flowers and flowers of *Impatiens* spp. from which animal visitors were excluded. Stars indicate the level of significance for intraspecific comparisons ***$P < 0.001$, **$P < 0.01$, *$P < 0.05$, n.s., not significant.

observed (Table 1). Visitor species included four bee species, one bird species, four butterfly species, one day-flying hawk moth species and four species grouped as 'other': one ant species; one cockroach species; one beetle species; and one fly species (Fig. 3; Table 1). Most *Impatiens* spp. were visited by more than one animal species (Figs 3, 4; Table 1).

During 44 h of observation on *I. muscicola*, only two visits by ants (*Tetraponera nigra*) and two by cockroaches, all after sunset, were recorded (Fig. 4; Table 1). Although pollen was present on the body of the cockroach (Video S1), it did not appear to visit flowers for foraging and seldom moved between flowers. No visitors were, therefore, considered effective pollinators of *I. muscicola* (Table 1).

In the same area as *I. muscicola*, *I. kerriae* was most frequently visited by bumblebees (*Bombus haemorrhoidalis*) throughout the day (mean visitation rate: 2.10 visits/h) (Figs 3, 4; Table 1). Bumblebees moved among flowers during foraging bouts and consistently contacted the anthers or stigmas and were therefore considered to be effective pollinators. The flower of *I. kerriae* is asymmetrical; the left-hand side of the lower lateral petal is slightly uplifted relative to the right-hand side, resulting in a wider entrance to the flower on the right-hand side. Bumblebees always entered flowers on the right-hand side and carried pollen consistently on the left-hand side of their upper thorax and wing (Figs 3, 5; Video S2). *Impatiens kerriae* also received visits from Mrs Gould's sunbird, *Aethopyga gouldiae*, which robbed nectar by piercing a hole in the outside of the spur (mean visitation rate: 0.59 visits/h) (Figs 3, 4; Video S1). Asian honey bees, *Apis cerana*, foraged for nectar (mean visitation rate: 0.15 visits/h) in the same way as bumblebees, but did not touch the anther due to their small size relative to the flowers (Figs 3, 4; Video S1). Day-flying hawkmoths, *Macroglossum belis*, visited flowers infrequently (mean visitation rate: 0.05 visits/h) during a short period before sunset (Figs 3, 4). Hawkmoths hovered in front of flowers while inserting the proboscis into the spur. Due to the rapid movement of *M. belis* it could not be confirmed whether it is an effective pollinator. Due to the low visitation rates of day-flying hawkmoths (1.7% of all visits), we considered only bees to be effective pollinators of *I. kerriae* (Table 1).

On *I. racemosa*, only two visits by bumblebees (*B. haemorrhoidalis*) were observed in the Chiang Dao Wildlife Sanctuary (mean visitation rate: 0.05 visits/h) (Fig. 4; Table 1). However, frequent visits by bumblebees (*B. haemorrhoidalis*) to *I. racemosa* were observed in Doi Inthanon (mean visitation rate: 6.00 visits/h) (Fig. 3). Bumblebees always landed on the lower lateral petals and probed the spur for nectar by inserting the proboscis through the entrance gap between the lateral united petals. Pollen was attached on the bumblebee head (Figs 3, 5; Video S2). Thus, only bees were considered as effective pollinators of *I. racemosa* (Table 1).

Impatiens chiangdaoensis was visited by six animal species (Fig. 4; Table 1). Day-flying hawkmoths, *M. belis*, frequently visited half an hour after sunrise and occasionally during the day in cloudy conditions (mean visitation rate: 0.40 visits/h) (Fig. 4). Hawkmoths probed flowers by inserting their long proboscides into the long floral spur to consume nectar and moved quickly among flowers. The rapid movement of hawkmoths prevented confirmation of their effectiveness as pollinators. Bumblebees (*B. haemorrhoidalis*) were the next most frequent day-time visitors (mean visitation rate: 0.37 visits/h) (Fig. 4). Pollen was deposited on the head when bumblebees entered flowers (Fig. 5). In approximately one-third of visits, bumblebees robbed nectar by biting a hole in the spur (Fig. 3; Table 1). Bristle beetles (order Coleoptera) were also often observed as floral visitors; these carried pollen on their wings, but seldom moved between flowers (mean visitation rate: 0.21 visits/h) (Fig. 4). Restricted demon butterflies, *Notocrypta curvifascia*, visited flowers during day time (mean visitation rate: 0.19 visits/h) (Figs 3, 4), landing on the lateral united petals and probing the spur with their long proboscides. Pollen was deposited on the proboscis (Fig. 3; Video S2). Fruit flies (Drosophilidae) were observed visiting, but seldom moved between the flowers (mean visitation rate: 0.08 visits/hour) or carried pollen (Fig. 4). Finally, Asian honey bees (*A. cerana*) visited flowers at a low frequency (mean visitation rate: 0.03 visits/h) (Table 1); pollen was attached on the head. *Impatiens chiangdaoensis* is characterized by a bimodal pollination system, including pollination by bees and Lepidoptera (Table 1).

Impatiens psittacina was visited by bumblebees (*B. haemorrhoidalis*) during daylight hours (mean visitation rate: 6.00 visits/h) (Figs 3, 4). Bumblebees landed on the lower lobe of the lateral united petals and crawled into the flowers to forage nectar from the spur. When departing a flower, bumblebees faced the direction of the spur, so that pollen was placed on the dorsal thorax under the wings, which unfolded as the bee moved backwards (Fig. 5; Video S2). In 41% of visits, bumblebees landed close to the spur on the outside of the flower and pierced through the apex of the spur to drink nectar without pollinating flowers (Video S1). During 20 h of observation, one visit by an unknown butterfly species and one by a day-flying hawkmoth were also recorded. Contact between these insects and plant reproductive parts

Table 1. Floral visitors, behaviour, pollen placement and visitation rates to seven *Impatiens* spp.

Impatiens species	Visitor species	Behaviour	Pollen placement site	Visits/h (number of hours observed)	Functional pollinator group
I. muscicola	Hymenoptera: Formicidae: *Tetraponera nigra*	Non-pollinating visitor	Non-specific	0.05 (44)	None
	Dictyoptera: Blattodea: unknown sp.	Non-pollinating visitor	Non-specific	0.05 (44)	
I. kerriae	Hymenoptera: Apidae: *Bombus haemorrhoidalis*	Pollinator	Left side of body	2.10 (39)	Bees
	Aves: Nectariniidae: *Aethopyga gouldiae*	Nectar robber	N/A	0.59 (39)	
	Hymenoptera: Apidae: *Apis cerana*	Nectar robber	N/A	0.15 (39)	
	Lepidoptera: Sphingidae: *Macroglossum belis*	Unknown	Unknown	0.05 (39)	
I. racemosa	Hymenoptera: Apidae: *Bombus haemorrhoidalis*	Pollinator	Head	0.05 (39)	Bees
I. chiangdaoensis	Lepidoptera: Sphingidae: *Macroglossum belis*	Unknown	Unknown	0.40 (37.5)	Bimodal: Bees and Lepidoptera
	Hymenoptera: Apidae:	Pollinator	Head	0.37 (37.5)	
	Bombus haemorrhoidalis	Nectar robber	N/A	0.16 (37.5)	
	Coleoptera: unknown sp.	Non-pollinating visitor	Non-specific	0.21 (37.5)	
	Lepidoptera: Hesperiidae: *Notocrypta curvifascia*	Pollinator	Proboscis	0.19 (37.5)	
	Diptera: Drosophilidae: unknown sp.	Non-pollinating visitor	Non-specific	0.08 (37.5)	
	Hymenoptera: Apidae: *Apis cerana*	Pollinator	Head	0.03 (37.5)	
I. psittacina	Hymenoptera: Apidae:	Pollinator	Dorsal thorax	3.55 (20)	Bees
	Bombus haemorrhoidalis	Nectar robber	N/A	2.45 (20)	
	Lepidoptera: Hesperiidae: unknown sp.	Unknown	Unknown	0.05 (20)	
	Lepidoptera: Sphingidae: *Macroglossum belis*	Unknown	Unknown	0.05 (20)	
I. santisukii	Lepidoptera: Hesperiidae: *Polytremis discreta discreta*	Pollinator	Proboscis	0.94 (36)	Bimodal: Bees and Lepidoptera
	Lepidoptera: Hesperiidae: *Polytremis lubricans lubricans*	Pollinator	Proboscis	0.31 (36)	
	Lepidoptera: Sphingidae: *Macroglossum belis*	Unknown	Unknown	0.28 (36)	
	Hymenoptera: Apidae: *Bombus haemorrhoidalis*	Pollinator	Head	0.28 (36)	
I. daraneenae	Hymenoptera: Apidae: unknown sp.	Pollinator	Right legs	1.42 (36)	Bees
	Lepidoptera: Hesperiidae: *Notocrypta curvifascia*	Nectar robber	N/A	0.61 (36)	
	Hymenoptera: Apidae: *Tetragonula* sp.	Pollen robber	N/A	0.55 (36)	
	Hymenoptera: Megachilidae: unknown sp.	Pollen robber	N/A	0.22 (36)	



A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H
I
J
K
L

Figure 3. *Impatiens* flowers, showing variation in colour and shape and floral visitors: *I. muscicola* (A); *I. santisukii* pollinated by *P. lubricans lubricans* (B) and *B. haemorrhoidalis* (C); *I. racemosa* pollinated by *B. haemorrhoidalis* (D); *I. chiangdaoensis* pollinated by *N. curvifascia* (E) and visited by a nectar-robbing *B. haemorrhoidalis* (F); *I. psittacina* pollinated by *B. haemorrhoidalis* (G); *I. kerriae* pollinated by *B. haemorrhoidalis* (H) and visited by *A. cerana* (I), *M. belis* (J), and *A. gouldiae* (K). *I. daraneenae* pollinated by an unknown bee species (Apidae) (L). Black arrow in (A) indicates the typical position of the shed anthers onto the lower lateral united petals, facilitating autonomous self-pollination. All other arrows indicate pollen placement sites on visiting bee species (C, D, G, H, L). Scale bar in (A) represents 1 mm, all other scale bars represent 10 mm.

could not be assessed. Due to the low relative visitation rate of Lepidoptera (1.6%), only bees were considered pollinators of *I. psittacina* (Table 1).

Impatiens santisukii was most frequently visited by two butterfly species; the Himalayan swift butterfly, *Polytremis discreta discreta*, and the contiguous swift butterfly, *Polytremis lubricans lubricans*, which visited flowers at a mean rate of 0.94 visits/h and 0.31 visits/h, respectively, during daylight hours (Fig. 4; Table 1). Butterflies always landed on the lateral united petals and used their extended proboscides to consume nectar from the long spur (Fig. 3; Video S2). Pollen was placed on the proboscis. The day-flying hawkmoth, *M. belis*, also visited flowers immediately after sunrise and immediately before sunset (mean visitation rate: of 0.28 visits/h) (Fig. 4), but it could not be determined whether the hawkmoth carried pollen. Bumblebees (*B. haemorrhoidalis*) visited flowers at a mean visitation rate of 0.28 visits/h (Fig. 4). They landed on the lateral united petals and probed the spur to consume nectar by inserting the proboscis through the floral entrance (a small gap between the lateral united petals). Pollen was attached on the head of bumblebees (Figs 3, 5; Video S2). *Impatiens santisukii* is characterized by a bimodal pollination system, including pollination by bees and Lepidoptera (Table 1).

Impatiens daraneenae was visited by four insect species (Table. 1). An unknown bee species (Apidae) was the most frequent visitor (mean visitation rate: 1.42 visits/h) (Fig. 4). The flower of *I. daraneenae* is asymmetrical (Fig. 3): the lateral united petals are distorted counter-clockwise, such that pollen is placed on the right legs of a bee as it enters a flower (Figs 3, 5; Video S2). The restricted demon butterfly, *N. curvifascia*, also visited flowers (mean visitation rate: 0.61 visits/h) (Fig. 4). These butterflies landed on the lateral united petals and they probed the spur for nectar by inserting their long proboscides through the wide floral entrance, but did not contact anther or stigma. Other bee species, *Tetragonula* sp. and an unknown bee species (Megachilidae), visited only male-stage flowers to collect pollen; these were therefore not considered pollinators (Table 1, Video S1). Bees were considered the only pollinator of *I. daraneenae* (Table 1).

Floral trait variation

The flowers of each studied *Impatiens* spp. differ in shape and colour (Fig. 3). Species cluster by predefined pollination categories based on functional pollinator group(s) (Table 1; Autonomous selfing, Bee pollination, Bee + Lepidoptera pollination) in multivariate space of floral trait variation (Fig. 6). The first two PC axes explained 89.9% of trait variance. PC 1 explained 71.7% of variation and correlated positively with all traits except spur length. PC 2 explained 18.2% of variation and correlated positively with spur length (Fig. 6). Floral traits were significantly more similar within than between pollination systems (Fig. 6).

Bee-pollinated species differed primarily in sepal dimensions (see Table S1 for all SIMPER results; 85.7% of variation; height 42%, width 24.2%, length 19.5%), whereas flower entrance size (9.6%) and spur length (4.7%) were more consistent. In contrast, differences in spur length characterized the most (87.6%) variation between the two bimodally (Bee and Lepidoptera) pollinated species, relative to more consistent sepal morphology (11.3%) and flower entrance dimensions (1.1%). Among species with different pollination systems, autogamous species differed from bee-pollinated species primarily in sepal dimensions (87.9%, of which length 39.2%, height 30.1%, width 18.6%), and from bimodally (bee and Lepidoptera) pollinated species primarily in spur length (87.0%). Flower entrance (14.2%), sepal dimensions (height 25.1%, length 27.5%, width 13.6%) and spur length (19.6%) varied to a comparable extent between bee-pollinated and bimodally (bee and Lepidoptera) pollinated species.

With the exception of *I. muscicola*, in which no nectar was found, mean nectar volume ranged between 1.89 μL (*I. daraneenae*) to 14.45 μL (*I. santisukii*) and sugar concentration between 32.7 and 39.6% (Table 2). Measured nectar properties, however, did not differ among species with different pollination systems (volume, $F_{1,2.76} = 6.82$, $P > 0.08$; concentration, $F_{1,2.84} = 0.32$, $P > 0.6$).




Figure 4. Visitation rates per hour by five functional pollinator groups to studied *Impatiens* spp. White shading indicates pollinating visits, grey shading indicates robbing visits or day-flying hawkmoth visits for which resulting pollination could not be confirmed. Perpendicular bars on the right-hand side indicate co-occurrence of species within 800 m in the Chiang Dao Wildlife Sanctuary.

DISCUSSION

The results showed that six out of seven studied *Impatiens* spp. in the Chiang Dao Wildlife Sanctuary relied on animal visits for pollination. One autogamous species was characterized by small, nectarless flowers. Among the animal-pollinated species, two distinct pollination systems were identified. Two species were characterized by a bimodal pollination system involving bees and Lepidoptera. Flowers of these species were characterized by a relatively narrow floral entrance. Four species, characterized by flowers with a large floral chamber and short nectar spur, appeared specialized for bee pollination. A single bee species, *Bombus haemorrhoidalis* (Apidae) was a pollinator of five of the studied *Impatiens* spp.; differences in floral morphology, including floral asymmetry, enable pollen placement by bee-pollinated species on four distinct sites on the bee body. Our results therefore confirm that floral diversity among the studied *Impatiens* spp. is associated with different pollination systems, but also with divergent use of the same pollinator.

The association between pollination systems and floral traits detected in our study depends on correct identification of pollination systems. The accuracy of pollination system assignments might be compromised for two reasons. Firstly, observations were restricted to a single season and region for each species (e.g. Traveset & Saez, 1997; Price *et al.*, 2005; De la Bandera & Traveset, 2006). As all species were studied in the same region and time period, however, we can exclude that spatial and/or temporal turnover in the pollination environment underlie the observed specialization in pollination systems. Therefore, the observed partitioning of the local pollinator fauna in our study area implies that the differences in specialized pollination systems are indeed associated with floral trait variation. Furthermore, several of the studied *Impatiens* spp. were characterized by a narrow distribution, including three species that are endemic to the study area. Spatial variation in pollination systems is unlikely to occur at the scale of a few kilometers (e.g. Johnson, 1997; Cosacov, Cocucci & Sersic, 2014; Van der Niet *et al.*, 2014). Finally, by assigning functional pollinator groups rather than pollinator species to *Impatiens* spp., we allow for some turnover in pollinator species within functional groups without affecting the assignment of pollination systems. Conversely, definition of pollination systems on the basis of functional groups rather than pollinator species, may also lead to underestimation of the level of specialization of pollination systems, if, for example, members within each functional group do not behave and interact similarly with flowers. In our study we used broadly defined functional pollinator groups, such as bees, birds and Lepidoptera. There is ample evidence that variation among bee species in body size and in the ability to detect specific floral cues is associated with floral variation (e.g. Johnson, Steiner & Kaiser, 2005; Cosacov *et al.*, 2014). In this context, it is notable that *I. daraneenae*, the only bee-pollinated species in our study that is not visited predominantly by *B. haemorrhoidalis*, occupies a distinct region in floral morphological space, which suggests that floral dimensions of this species differ from those of other bee-pollinated *Impatiens* spp. such as *I. kerriae* and *I. psittacina*. Further research is required to assess whether the functional groups used in our study adequately describe pollination systems in *Impatiens*, or whether further specialization for pollination by different species within functional groups may occur.

The second aspect of this study that could potentially affect accuracy of pollination system assignments is that, although we incorporated visitation frequency in the calculation of pollinator importance,




Figure 5. Diagram of a bee body showing pollen placement for six *Impatiens* spp. that are (partly) bee pollinated. The most common bee pollinator is *B. haemorrhoidalis* and *I. dararneenae* is predominantly pollinated by an unknown bee (Apidae).

we did not take visitation efficiency into account. The theoretical basis for expecting associations between pollinators and floral traits was articulated in the most effective pollinator principle (MEPP) (cf. Stebbins, 1970). According to this principle, flowers are moulded by visitors that visit plants most frequently and efficiently (but see Aigner, 2001). If pollination efficiency and frequency are not associated, a less frequent visitor may be a more important pollinator in terms of natural selection (e.g. Mayfield *et al.*, 2001). The similarity in spur length of *I. santisukii* with that of bee-pollinated species might be explained, consistent with the MEPP, if bees are, as suggested by apparently much larger pollen loads, more efficient and thus more effective pollinators despite more frequent but probably relatively inefficient visitation by butterflies. Experiments designed to quantify the pollination efficiency, for instance by assessing fruit and seed set resulting from a single pollinator visit to a virgin flower (e.g. Janecek *et al.*, 2011), could reveal important information on pollination efficiency of different functional pollinator groups. Such experiments would also provide insight into the role of the day-flying hawkmoth species *M. bellis*, which visited several *Impatiens* spp. studied here. Previous studies on *Impatiens* pollination also reported visits by *Macroglossum* spp. (Kato *et al.*, 1991; Tian *et al.*, 2004; Sreekala *et al.*, 2008, 2011). The study by Sreekala *et al.* (2011) and Tian *et al.* (2004) mention that caught *Macroglossum* individuals carried *Impatiens* pollen. However, further studies are required to determine whether *Macroglossum* spp. are *Impatiens* pollinators or nectar robbers (e.g. Kishore *et al.*, 2012). Our pollinator categorization is unlikely to be strongly affected by variation in pollination efficiency. Firstly, our analyses did not rely on relative efficiency of different functional pollinator groups and, secondly, we used the inclusive category 'Lepidoptera' to accommodate the potential role of *Macroglossum* as a pollinator.

Hypothesized associations between floral types and functional pollinator groups in *Impatiens* were limited to animal-pollinated categories (Vogel, 1954; Grey-Wilson, 1980). However, our study revealed




Figure 6. First two axes of a principle components analysis of floral traits among six studied *Impatiens* spp. Lines indicate correlation of floral characters with the first two PCA axes. Species that share a pollination system are significantly more similar in floral traits compared with other species.

Table 2. Nectar volume and sugar concentration (mean ± SE) of *Impatiens* spp. with different pollination systems

	Autogamous selfing (1, 5)	Bee (3, 17)	Butterfly and bee (2, 14)
Volume (μL)	0 ± 0	6.18 ± 1.83	13.55 ± 2.57
Concentration (% m/m)	n/a	38.14 ± 2.06	36.63 ± 2.97

Values between brackets indicate the number of species and total number of measurements, respectively.

that not all *Impatiens* spp. rely on animal visits for pollination and that the autogamous pollination system is associated with a distinct suite of floral traits. Initially, it was thought that *Impatiens* spp. were characterized by extreme herkogamy, the separation of male and female floral phases, by complete shedding of anthers before the stigma became receptive (Faegri & van der Pijl, 1979), which is often an efficient mechanism for avoiding autogamy and its negative consequences for fitness. However, other studies have already found evidence for autogamous pollination in *Impatiens* (Kato *et al.*, 1991; Tian *et al.*, 2004). In contrast with our findings, autogamy in Kato *et al.* (1991) and Tian *et al.* (2004) was associated with visits by pollinators and showy, large, nectar-producing flowers, perhaps serving as a mechanism of reproductive assurance (cf. Kalisz, Vogler & Hanley, 2004). Flowers of *I. muscicola* are small, do not produce nectar and appear adapted to self-pollination (cf. Tedder *et al.*, 2015), although we cannot completely exclude the possibility that the infrequent visits by ants and cockroaches contribute to fecundity in this species.

Among the animal-pollinated species, we identified two distinct floral syndromes, which were mainly determined by the shape of the lower sepal and length of the nectar spur. These two types of floral syndromes are largely congruent with the 'melittophilous' and 'psychophilous' types recognized by Vogel (1954) and the similar 'flat type' and a

subcategory within the 'funnel type' flower of Grey-Wilson (1980). Pollination studies performed on African *Impatiens* spp. had already confirmed predicted associations between certain floral shapes and bird pollination (Janecek *et al.*, 2015). It appears that floral shape is a good indicator of broadly categorized pollination systems. Specifically, the size of the floral chamber varied between pollination systems, probably owing to different foraging behaviour of bees, which mostly crawl into the flower, and Lepidoptera which only insert their proboscis into the flower. More studies including pollinator observations are required to assess whether generalizations of associations between floral types and pollination systems are valid. Flower colour variation and nectar characteristics were not strongly associated with differences in pollination systems among species studied here. Although butterflies appeared to only visit pink-flowered *Impatiens* spp., bees and day-flying hawkmoths largely visited species regardless of flower colour, as functional pollinators and as nectar robbers. In the presumed absence of floral scent (none was detectable to the human nose), it seems likely that the main difference in floral traits associated with different functional pollinator groups involves traits related to the mechanical fit between flowers and visitors, rather than those related to pollinator attraction and behaviour (e.g. Miller, Raguso & Kay, 2014). If flowers do not filter visitors based on perceptional bias among animal species, flower visitation would be determined primarily by accessibility and palatability of the reward. Even visitors which are clearly mismatched with the flowers they visit, might occasionally successfully access the reward and pollinate flowers (e.g. de Merxem *et al.*, 2009). In those cases, strong selection on floral traits might lead to rapid adaptation to the locally most effective pollinator. The species with bimodal pollination systems studied here might thus represent a transitional stage in a shift from one specialized pollination system to another (cf. Stebbins, 1970), rather than a stable state. Phylogenetic studies could reveal the signatures of frequent pollinator shifts by estimating the frequency of correlated shifts in floral traits and pollination systems throughout the evolutionary history of *Impatiens* (Van der Niet & Johnson, 2012).

Six out of the seven studied *Impatiens* spp. were visited and pollinated by bees; four species appear specialized for bee pollination. Several bee-pollinated species occur in the same area and partially co-flower, raising the possibility of reproductive interference due to heterospecific pollen-transfer (HPT), which has been shown to reduce fecundity in other co-flowering *Impatiens* spp. that share pollinators (Tokuda *et al.*, 2015). Among species studied here, HPT might be reduced through divergent use of the same pollinator (cf. Johnson, 2010). Specifically, four distinct sites of pollen placement on bee bodies were identified in our study (Fig. 5), partly owing to variation in the dimensions of the floral chamber, which might contribute to reduced HPT (cf. Waterman *et al.*, 2011; Huang & Shi, 2013). Indeed, different pollen placement sites were previously suggested as mechanisms to avoid HPT in *Impatiens* (Kato *et al.*, 1991; Bartos & Janecek, 2014). In *I. kerriae* and *I. daraneenae*, specific pollen placement was realized by floral asymmetry. The direction of asymmetry is monomorphic in populations for the species studied here, suggesting that, unlike enantiostyly, it probably does not serve as a mechanism for promoting outcrossing (e.g. Jesson & Barrett, 2002). Mechanisms of floral asymmetry that are not limited to the position of anthers and/or stigma or which do not only involve contortion of the corolla, are relatively rare in angiosperms (Endress, 2012), but were previously reported in *Impatiens*, also as a supposed mechanism to avoid reproductive interference (Kato *et al.*, 1991). Further *Impatiens* spp. in Southeast Asia also appear to be characterized by asymmetrical flowers (Yu, 2012), suggesting that floral asymmetry might be relatively widespread in this region. Three alternative processes related to avoidance of HPT could generate a large number of species with asymmetrical flowers. First, the trait might provide a strong ecological advantage for invading existing *Impatiens* communities through the avoidance of competition ('community invasion' hypothesis, Sargent & Ackerly, 2008). As a result, clades with asymmetrical flowers might become widespread and proliferate. A signature of this process would be enhanced diversification rates of clades with asymmetrical flowers. Second, selection might favour the evolution of asymmetrical flowers as a mechanism of character displacement to avoid HPT ('character displacement' hypothesis, Armbruster & Muchhala, 2009). This would be expressed as frequent shifts towards floral asymmetry and the occurrence of intraspecific polymorphism for asymmetry (i.e. symmetrical and asymmetrical ecotypes), depending on the local *Impatiens* community. Finally, floral asymmetry might serve as a mechanism of reproductive isolation through reinforcement (the *Pedicularis* L. type of ethological isolation in the 'reproductive isolation' hypothesis; Grant, 1994). This would lead to similar patterns to those as predicted for the character displacement hypothesis, but would specifically require that communities are composed of closely related species capable of hybridizing. Given that the reproductive isolation hypothesis was rejected in a similar study system due to insufficiently precise pollen placement (Armbruster *et al.*, 2014) and since bee-pollinated species with different

pollen placement sites are not sister species (Ruchisansakun *et al.*, 2015), it is unlikely that the reproductive isolation hypothesis explains the common occurrence of asymmetry in *Impatiens*. Phylogenetic evidence would be invaluable to distinguish between the 'community invasion' and 'character displacement' hypotheses (Sargent & Ackerly, 2008; Eaton *et al.*, 2012). Although no formal analyses have been performed, the phylogenetic tree of Ruchisansakun *et al.* (2015) suggests that floral asymmetry has evolved multiple times, a hypothesis that is further supported by the distinct and therefore probably non-homologous mechanisms of floral asymmetry in *I. kerriae* and *I. daraneenae*.

Our study confirms predictions about associations between floral traits and pollination systems for one of the most spectacular floral radiations of the Old World tropics. Future work should focus on inclusion of more taxa and floral types, in particular, those hypothesized to be associated with long-tongued hawkmoth pollination (Vogel, 1954; Grey-Wilson, 1980), which are as yet unstudied. However, to clarify the role of pollinators in driving floral divergence, it is also important that evolutionary patterns are investigated, by implementing phylogenetic methods, and to evaluate the processes that might have generated these patterns. In particular, the role of pollinators as selective agents on floral traits could be tested by using manipulative experiments.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank Mr Somsak Thithichayaporn, the chief of Chiang Dao Wildlife Sanctuary, for permission to work inside the reserve. Adam Shuttleworth helped with statistical analyses, Maarten van 't Zelfde assisted with the design of the distribution map. We thank Dr Karl Duffy and two anonymous reviewers for useful comments on an earlier draft of this paper. This research was funded by a Development and Promotion of Science and Technology talents project (DPST) scholarship, provided by the Thai Institute for the Promotion of Teaching Science and Technology (IPST).

REFERENCES

Aigner PA. 2001. Optimality modeling and fitness trade-offs: when should plants become pollinator specialists? *Oikos* **95:** 177–184.

Armbruster WS, Herzig AL. 1984. Partitioning and sharing of pollinators by four sympatric species of *Dalechampia* (Euphorbiaceae) in Panama. *Annals of the Missouri Botanical Garden* **71:** 1–16.

Armbruster WS, Muchhala N. 2009. Associations between floral specialization and species diversity: cause, effect, or correlation? *Evolutionary Ecology* **23:** 159–179.

Armbruster WS, Shi XQ, Huang SQ. 2014. Do specialized flowers promote reproductive isolation? Realized pollination accuracy of three sympatric *Pedicularis* species. *Annals of Botany* **113:** 331–340.

Baker HG, Baker I. 1983. Floral nectar sugar constituents in relation to pollinator type. In: Jones CE, Little RJ, eds. *Handbook of experimental pollination biology*. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold Co., 117–141.

Bartos M, Janecek S. 2014. Pollinator-induced twisting of flowers sidesteps floral architecture constraints. *Current Biology* **24:** R793–R795.

Clarke KR. 1993. Non-parametric multivariate analyses of changes in community structure. *Australian Journal of Ecology* **18:** 117–143.

Clarke KR, Gorley RN. 2006. *Primer v6: user manual/tutorial*. Plymouth: Primer-E Ltd.

Cosacov A, Cocucci AA, Sersic AN. 2014. Geographical differentiation in floral traits across the distribution range of the Patagonian oil-secreting *Calceolaria polyrhiza*: do pollinators matter? *Annals of Botany* **113:** 251–266.

Dalsgaard B, Magard E, Fjeldsa J, Gonzalez AMM, Rahbek C, Olesen JM, Ollerton J, Alarcon R, Araujo AC, Cotton PA, Lara C, Machado CG, Sazima I, Sazima M, Timmermann A, Watts S, Sandel B, Sutherland WJ, Svenning J-C. 2011. Specialization in plant-hummingbird networks is associated with species richness, contemporary precipitation and quaternary climate-change velocity. *PLoS ONE* **6:** 1–7.

Darwin CR. 1862. *On the various contrivances by which British and foreign orchids are fertilized by insects*. London: John Murray.

De Jager ML, Ellis AG. 2014. Floral polymorphism and the fitness implications of attracting pollinating and florivorous insects. *Annals of Botany* **113:** 213–222.

De la Bandera MC, Traveset A. 2006. Breeding system and spatial variation in the pollination biology of the heterocarpic *Thymelaea velutina* (Thymelaeaceae). *Plant Systematics and Evolution* **257:** 9–23.

Eaton DAR, Fenster CB, Hereford J, Huang SQ, Ree RH. 2012. Floral diversity and community structure in *Pedicularis* (Orobanchaceae). *Ecology* **93:** S182–S194.

Endress PK. 2012. The immense diversity of floral monosymmetry and asymmetry across angiosperms. *Botanical Review* **78:** 345–397.

Faegri K, van der Pijl L. 1979. *The principles of pollination ecology*. Oxford: Pergamon.

Fenster CB, Armbruster WS, Wilson P, Dudash MR, Thomson JD. 2004. Pollination syndromes and floral specialization. *Annual Review of Ecology Evolution and Systematics* **35:** 375–403.

Fishbein M, Venable DL. 1996. Diversity and temporal change in the effective pollinators of *Asclepias tuberosa*. *Ecology* **77:** 1061–1073.

Freitas L, Galetto L, Sazima M. 2006. Pollination by hummingbirds and bees in eight syntopic species and a putative

hybrid of Ericaceae in Southeastern Brazil. *Plant Systematics and Evolution* **258:** 49–61.

Goldblatt P, Manning JC. 2006. Radiation of pollination systems in the Iridaceae of sub-Saharan Africa. *Annals of Botany* **97:** 317–344.

Grant V. 1994. Modes and origins of mechanical and ethological isolation in angiosperms. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* **91:** 3–10.

Grant V, Grant KA. 1965. *Flower pollination in the phlox family*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Grey-Wilson C. 1980. *Impatiens of Africa*. Rotterdam: A.A. Balkema.

Hammer Ø, Harper DAT, Ryan PD. 2001. PAST: paleontological statistics software package for education and data analysis. *Palaeontologia Electronica* **4:** 1–9.

Huang SQ, Shi XQ. 2013. Floral isolation in *Pedicularis*: how do congeners with shared pollinators minimize reproductive interference? *New Phytologist* **199:** 858–865.

Janecek S, Bartos M, Njabo KY. 2015. Convergent evolution of sunbird pollination systems of Impatiens species in tropical Africa and hummingbird systems of the New World. *Biological Journal of the Linnean Society* **115:** 127–133.

Janecek S, Patacova E, Bartos M, Padysakova E, Spitzer L, Tropek R. 2011. Hovering sunbirds in the Old World: occasional behaviour or evolutionary trend? *Oikos* **120:** 178–183.

Janssens SB, Knox EB, Huysmans S, Smets EF, Merckx V. 2009. Rapid radiation of *Impatiens* (Balsaminaceae) during Pliocene and Pleistocene: result of a global climate change. *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution* **52:** 806–824.

Jesson LK, Barrett SCH. 2002. Enantiostyly in *Wachendorfia* (Haemodoraceae): the influence of reproductive systems on the maintenance of the polymorphism. *American Journal of Botany* **89:** 253–262.

Johnson SD. 1997. Pollination ecotypes of *Satyrium hallackii* (Orchidaceae) in South Africa. *Botanical Journal of the Linnean Society* **123:** 225–235.

Johnson SD. 2010. The pollination niche and its role in the diversification and maintenance of the southern African flora. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B-Biological Sciences* **365:** 499–516.

Johnson SD, Peter CI, Ellis AG, Boberg E, Botes C, van der Niet T. 2011. Diverse pollination systems of the twin-spurred orchid genus *Satyrium* in African grasslands. *Plant Systematics and Evolution* **292:** 95–103.

Johnson SD, Steiner KE. 2003. Specialized pollination systems in southern Africa. *South African Journal of Science* **99:** 345–348.

Johnson SD, Steiner KE, Kaiser R. 2005. Deceptive pollination in two subspecies of *Disa spathulata* (Orchidaceae) differing in morphology and floral fragrance. *Plant Systematics and Evolution* **255:** 87–98.

Kalisz S, Vogler DW, Hanley KM. 2004. Context-dependent autonomous self-fertilization yields reproductive assurance and mixed mating. *Nature* **430:** 884–887.

Kato M. 1988. Bumblebee visits to *Impatiens* spp. – pattern and efficiency. *Oecologia* **76:** 364–370.

Kato M, Itino T, Hotta M, Inoue T. 1991. Pollination of four Sumatran *Impatiens* species by hawkmoths and bees. *Tropics* **1:** 59–73.

Kishore K, Kalita H, Rinchen D, Lepcha B. 2012. Evidence of functional specialization and pollination syndrome in *Amomum subulatum* Roxb. (Zingiberaceae). *Current Science* **103:** 193–199.

Mayfield MM, Waser NM, Price MV. 2001. Exploring the 'most effective pollinator principle' with complex flowers: bumblebees and *Ipomopsis aggregata*. *Annals of Botany* **88:** 591–596.

de Merxem DG, Borremans B, de Jager ML, Johnson T, Jooste M, Ros P, Zenni RD, Ellis AG, Anderson B. 2009. The importance of flower visitors not predicted by floral syndromes. *South African Journal of Botany* **75:** 660–667.

Miller TJ, Raguso RA, Kay KM. 2014. Novel adaptation to hawkmoth pollinators in *Clarkia* reduces efficiency, not attraction of diurnal visitors. *Annals of Botany* **113:** 317–329.

Mohandass D. 2013. Pollination ecology of *Impatiens rufescens* (Balsaminaceae) an endemic annual herb from Nilgiri mountains Western Ghats India. *International Journal of Ecology and Environmental Science* **39:** 59–63.

Ollerton J. 2012. Biogeography: are tropical species less specialised? *Current Biology* **22:** R914–R915.

Ollerton J, Cranmer L. 2002. Latitudinal trends in plant-pollinator interactions: are tropical plants more specialised? *Oikos* **98:** 340–350.

Pauw A, Stanway R. 2015. Unrivalled specialization in a pollination network from South Africa reveals that specialization increases with latitude only in the Southern Hemisphere. *Journal of Biogeography* **42:** 652–661.

Pianka ER. 1966. Latitudinal gradients in species diversity – a review of concepts. *American Naturalist* **100:** 33–46.

Price MV, Waser NM, Irwin RE, Campbell DR, Brody AK. 2005. Temporal and spatial variation in pollination of a montane herb: a seven-year study. *Ecology* **86:** 2106–2116.

Ramasubbu R, Sreekala AK, Pandurangan AG, Kulloli SK. 2011. Reproductive ecology of *Impatiens platyadena* Fischer, a critically endangered balsam of Western Ghats. *Current Science* **100:** 1550–1554.

Ruchisansakun S, Van der Niet T, Janssens SB, Triboun P, Techaprasan J, Jenjittikul T, Suksathan P. 2015. Phylogenetic analyses of molecular data and reconstruction of morphological character evolution in Asian *Impatiens* section *Semeiocardium* (Balsaminaceae). *Systematic Botany* **40:** 1063–1074.

Rust RW. 1977. Pollination in *Impatiens capensis* and *Impatiens pallida* (Balsaminaceae). *Bulletin of the Torrey Botanical Club* **104:** 361–367.

Sargent RD, Ackerly DD. 2008. Plant-pollinator interactions and the assembly of plant communities. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* **23:** 123–130.

Schemske DW. 1978. Evolution of reproductive characteristics in *Impatiens* (Balsaminaceae): the significance of cleistogamy and chasmogamy. *Ecology* **59:** 596–613.

Schemske DW, Mittelbach GG, Cornell HV, Sobel JM, Roy K. 2009. Is there a latitudinal gradient in the importance of biotic interactions? *Annual Review of Ecology Evolution and Systematics* **40:** 245–269.

Schleuning M, Fruend J, Klein A-M, Abrahamczyk S, Alarcon R, Albrecht M, Andersson GKS, Bazarian S, Boehning-Gaese K, Bommarco R, Dalsgaard B, Dehling DM, Gotlieb A, Hagen M, Hickler T, Holzschuh A, Kaiser-Bunbury CN, Kreft H, Morris RJ, Sandel B, Sutherland WJ, Svenning J-C, Tscharntke T, Watts S, Weiner CN, Werner M, Williams NM, Winqvist C, Dormann CF, Bluethgen N. 2012. Specialization of mutualistic interaction networks decreases toward tropical latitudes. *Current Biology* **22:** 1925–1931.

Smith SD, Ané C, Baum DA. 2008. The role of pollinator shifts in the floral diversification of *Iochroma* (Solanaceae). *Evolution* **63:** 793–806.

Sreekala AK, Pandurangan AG, Ramasubbu R, Kulloli SK. 2008. Reproductive biology of *Impatiens coelotropis* Fischer, a critically endangered balsam from the Southern Western Ghats. *Current Science* **95:** 386–388.

Sreekala AK, Pandurangan AG, Ramasubbu R, Kulloli SK. 2011. Pollination biology of *Impatiens cuspidata* Wight and Arn. (Balsaminaceae), a rare and endemic balsam of the Western Ghats, India. *Journal of Threatened Taxa* **3:** 1818–1825.

Stebbins GL. 1970. Adaptive radiation of reproductive characteristics in angiosperms. I. Pollination mechanisms. *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics* **1:** 307–326.

Strauss SY, Whittall JB. 2006. Non-pollinator agents of selection on floral traits. In: Harder LD, Barrett SCH, eds. *The ecology and evolution of flowers*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 120–138.

Tedder A, Carleial S, Golebiewska M, Kappel C, Shimizu KK, Stift M. 2015. Evolution of the selfing syndrome in *Arabis alpina* (Brassicaceae). *PLoS ONE* **10:**1–17.

Tian JP, Liu KM, Hu GW. 2004. Pollination ecology and pollination system of *Impatiens reptans* (Balsaminaceae) endemic to China. *Annals of Botany* **93:** 167–175.

Tokuda N, Hattori M, Abe K, Shinohara Y, Nagano Y, Itino T. 2015. Demonstration of pollinator-mediated competition between two native *Impatiens* species, *Impatiens noli-tangere* and *I. textori* (Balsaminaceae). *Ecology and Evolution* **5:** 1271–1277.

Traveset A, Saez E. 1997. Pollination of *Euphorbia dendroides* by lizards and insects: spatio-temporal variation in patterns of flower visitation. *Oecologia* **111:** 241–248.

Tripp EA, Manos PS. 2008. Is floral specialization and evolutionary dead end? Pollination system transitions in *Ruellia* (Acanthaceae). *Evolution* **62:** 1712–1737.

Valente LM, Manning JC, Goldblatt P, Vargas P. 2012. Did pollination shifts drive diversification in Southern African *Gladiolus*? Evaluating the model of pollinator-driven speciation. *American Naturalist* **180:** 83–98.

Van der Niet T, Johnson SD. 2012. Phylogenetic evidence for pollinator-driven diversification of angiosperms. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* **27:** 353–361.

Van der Niet T, Pirie MD, Shuttleworth A, Johnson SD, Midgley JJ. 2014. Do pollinator distributions underlie the evolution of pollination ecotypes in the Cape shrub *Erica plukenetii*? *Annals of Botany* **113:** 301–315.

Vogel S. 1954. *Blütenbiologische Typen als Elemente der Sippengliederung, dargestellt anhand der Flora Südafrikas*. Jena: Fischer.

Wang Q, Li YX, Pu XZ, Zhu LY, Tang Z, Liu Q. 2013. Pollinators and nectar robbers cause directional selection for large spur circle in *Impatiens oxyanthera* (Balsaminaceae). *Plant Systematics and Evolution* **299:** 1263–1274.

Waser NM, Chittka L, Price MV, Williams NM, Ollerton J. 1996. Generalization in pollination systems, and why it matters. *Ecology* **77:** 1043–1060.

Waterman RJ, Bidartondo MI, Stofberg J, Combs JK, Gebauer G, Savolainen V, Barraclough TG, Pauw A. 2011. The effects of above- and belowground mutualisms on orchid speciation and coexistence. *American Naturalist* **177:** E54–E68.

Whittall JB, Hodges SA. 2007. Pollinator shifts drive increasingly long nectar spurs in columbine flowers. *Nature* **447:** 706–712.

Wilson P. 1995. Selection for pollination success and the mechanical fit of *Impatiens* flowers around bumblebee bodies. *Biological Journal of the Linnean Society* **55:** 355–383.

Wolf S, Moritz RFA. 2008. Foraging distance in *Bombus terrestris* L. (Hymenoptera: Apidae). *Apidologie* **39:** 419–427.

Yu SX. 2012. *Balsaminaceae of China*. Beijing: Peking University Press.

Yu SX, Janssens SB, Zhu XY, Lidén M, Gao TG, Wang W. 2015. Phylogeny of *Impatiens* (Balsaminaceae): integrating molecular and morphological evidence into a new classification. *Cladistics* **32:** 179–197.

Yuan YM, Song Y, Geuten K, Rahelivololona E, Wohlhauser S, Fischer E, Smets E, Kupfer P. 2004. Phylogeny and biogeography of Balsaminaceae inferred from ITS sequences. *Taxon* **53:** 391–403.

SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Additional Supporting Information may be found in the online version of this article:

Video S1. Non-pollinating visitors to *Impatiens* species at Chiangdao.
Video S2. *Impatiens* pollinators at Chiangdao.
Figure S1. Diagrammatic representation of the five floral traits measured in this study.
Table S1. Percentage contribution to dissimilarity in floral traits within and between pollination systems, as derived from the SIMPER analysis.