



LJMU Research Online

Gonzalez-Zamora, A, Arroyo-Rodriguez, V, Escobar, F, Oyama, K, Aureli, F and Stoner, KE

Sleeping-tree fidelity of the spider monkey shapes community-level seed-rain patterns in continuous and fragmented rain forests

<http://researchonline.ljmu.ac.uk/id/eprint/3111/>

Article

Citation (please note it is advisable to refer to the publisher's version if you intend to cite from this work)

Gonzalez-Zamora, A, Arroyo-Rodriguez, V, Escobar, F, Oyama, K, Aureli, F and Stoner, KE (2015) Sleeping-tree fidelity of the spider monkey shapes community-level seed-rain patterns in continuous and fragmented rain forests. JOURNAL OF TROPICAL ECOLOGY. 31 (4). pp. 305-313. ISSN 0266-

LJMU has developed [LJMU Research Online](#) for users to access the research output of the University more effectively. Copyright © and Moral Rights for the papers on this site are retained by the individual authors and/or other copyright owners. Users may download and/or print one copy of any article(s) in LJMU Research Online to facilitate their private study or for non-commercial research. You may not engage in further distribution of the material or use it for any profit-making activities or any commercial gain.

The version presented here may differ from the published version or from the version of the record. Please see the repository URL above for details on accessing the published version and note that access may require a subscription.

For more information please contact researchonline@ljmu.ac.uk

<http://researchonline.ljmu.ac.uk/>



Sleeping-tree fidelity of spider monkey shapes community-level seed-rain patterns in continuous and fragmented rain forests

Journal:	<i>Journal Of Tropical Ecology</i>
Manuscript ID:	JTE-15-088.R4
Manuscript Type:	Full Paper
Date Submitted by the Author:	n/a
Complete List of Authors:	González-Zamora, Arturo; Universidad Veracruzana, Instituto de Investigaciones Biológicas; Instituto de Ecología A.C., División de Posgrado Arroyo-Rodríguez, Victor; Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, Instituto de Investigaciones en Ecosistemas y Sustentabilidad Escobar Sarria, Federico; Instituto de Ecología A.C, Red de Ecoetología Oyama, Ken; Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, Escuela Nacional de Estudios Superiores Aureli, Filippo; Liverpool John Moores University, 3Research Centre in Evolutionary Anthropology and Palaeoecology, School of Natural Sciences and Psychology. Stoner, Kathryn; New Mexico State University, Department of Fish, Wildlife, and Conservation Ecology
Keywords:	aggregated seed dispersal, Ateles, FRUGIVORY, forest fragmentation, Lacandona, PRIMATES, sleeping site

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3
4 **Short title:** Sleeping-tree fidelity shapes seed-rain patterns
5
6
7
8
9

10 **Sleeping-tree fidelity of the spider monkey shapes community-level seed-**
11 **rain patterns in continuous and fragmented rain forests**
12
13
14
15

16 Arturo González-Zamora*^{§§}¹, Víctor Arroyo-Rodríguez[†], Federico Escobar[‡], Ken
17 Oyama[†][§], Filippo Aureli^{**}, and Kathryn E. Stoner^{††}
18
19
20
21
22

23 *División de Posgrado, Instituto de Ecología A.C., Xalapa, Veracruz, Mexico
24
25

26 [†]Instituto de Investigaciones en Ecosistemas y Sustentabilidad, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de
27 México, Morelia, Michoacán, Mexico
28
29

30 [‡]Red de Ecoetología, Instituto de Ecología A.C., Xalapa, Veracruz, Mexico
31
32

33 [§]Escuela Nacional de Estudios Superiores, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, Morelia,
34 Michoacán, Mexico
35

36 ^{**}Instituto de Neuroetología, Universidad Veracruzana, Xalapa, Mexico, and Research Centre in
37 Evolutionary Anthropology and Palaeoecology, Liverpool John Moores University, Liverpool,
38 United Kingdom
39
40

41 ^{††}Department of Fish, Wildlife, and Conservation Ecology, New Mexico State University, Las
42 Cruces, New Mexico, USA
43
44

45 ^{§§}Current address: Instituto de Investigaciones Biológicas, Universidad Veracruzana, Xalapa,
46 Veracruz, Mexico
47
48
49

50 ¹Corresponding author. Tel.: +52 (2281) 536279.
51 E-mail address: toztlan@yahoo.com.mx
52
53
54

55 **Keywords:** aggregated seed dispersal, *Ateles*, frugivory, forest fragmentation, Lacandona, primates,
56 sleeping site
57
58
59
60

ABSTRACT

Repeated use of sleeping trees (STs) by frugivores promotes the deposition and aggregation of copious amounts of seed, thus having key implications for seed dispersal and forest regeneration. Seed-rain patterns produced by this behaviour likely depend on the frequency of use of these sites, yet this hypothesis has been poorly tested. We evaluated community-level seed-rain patterns produced by the spider monkey (*Ateles geoffroyi*) over 13 mo in latrines located beneath 60 STs in the Lacandona rain forest, Mexico. Because this primate is increasingly 'forced' to inhabit fragmented landscapes, we tested whether sleeping-tree fidelity (STF) differed among sites and between continuous and fragmented forests. We also tested whether seed-rain patterns were associated with STF within each site and forest type. STF was highly variable among STs (average = 7 mo, range = 1-12 mo), but did not differ among study sites or forest types. STF was positively associated with seed abundance, species diversity and species turnover. Nevertheless, STF tended to be negatively related to seed community evenness. These results are likely due to the most frequently used STs being in areas with greater food density. Our results demonstrate that site fidelity shapes community-level seed-rain patterns and thus has key ecological implications.

INTRODUCTION

The repeated use of perches, roosting sites, reproductive sites and sleeping sites over time by frugivorous vertebrates promotes the deposition and aggregation of copious amounts of seed in these sites (Russo & Augspurger 2004, Wenny 2001). These behaviours have key implications for seed dispersal and forest regeneration (Jordano & Schupp 2000), particularly in tropical forests where up to 94% of woody plant species are dispersed by frugivorous animals (Jordano 1992). The importance of this spatially aggregated pattern of seed deposition for seed dispersal is largely dependent on site fidelity, that is, on the frequency of use of these sites over time (Russo & Augspurger 2004, Russo *et al.* 2006); yet, empirical evidence about this relationship is scarce.

Site fidelity is particularly common in territorial animals (Börger *et al.* 2008), such as Geoffroy's spider monkey (*Ateles geoffroyi*) (Chapman *et al.* 1995). This primate is a highly specialized frugivore (González-Zamora *et al.* 2009, Russo *et al.* 2005) that defends stable home ranges, within which the spider monkey concentrate its activities in areas of higher quality (i.e. the so-called 'core areas'; Asensio *et al.* 2012a). As multi-central place foragers (*sensu* Chapman *et al.* 1989), they feed on several plants located near sleeping trees (STs), and return to the same or different STs after their feeding excursions. An important fraction of seeds swallowed by these primates are defecated in latrines located beneath these STs (González-Zamora *et al.* 2014, Russo & Augspurger 2004, Russo *et al.* 2006), particularly beneath in those located within core areas, and hence, variation in sleeping-tree fidelity (STF) is expected to alter patterns of seed rain within latrines.

Here, we evaluated the frequency of use of 60 STs by *A. geoffroyi* and the seed-rain patterns produced by this primate during a 13-mo period in two continuous forest sites (CF)

1
2
3
4 and three forest fragments (FF) in the fragmented Lacandona rain forest, Mexico. Because
5
6 the potential variation between continuous and fragmented forests in STF has not been
7
8 previously evaluated, we first tested whether STF (operationally defined as the number of
9
10 months each ST is used) differed among the five study sites and between forest types
11
12 (continuous and fragmented forests). For each study site and forest type, we assessed the
13
14 association between STF and six community-level attributes of seed assemblages
15
16 (Tuomisto 2010): abundance of seeds, species diversity of seeds (i.e. species richness,
17
18 exponential of Shannon's entropy and inverse Simpson concentration), community
19
20 evenness, and seed species turnover (β -diversity) between STs. This information has
21
22 critical ecological implications, as *A. geoffroyi* are increasingly forced to inhabit
23
24 fragmented landscapes (Ramos-Fernández & Wallace 2008), but we do not know if their
25
26 seed-dispersal services may be altered in forest fragments (but see Chaves *et al.* 2011,
27
28 González-Zamora *et al.* 2014).

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
STF of spider monkeys is expected to be higher in forest fragments (González-
Zamora *et al.* 2012), as the home ranges of these primates in fragments are smaller than in
continuous forest sites (Chaves *et al.* 2012). Although it is reasonable to expect that the
abundance and diversity of seeds increase with STF, such associations largely depend on
food availability within the home range. Because the STs most frequently used are expected
to function as key nodes within foraging networks routes that connect core areas (Di Fiore
& Suarez 2007, Suarez *et al.* 2014), we predicted STF to be positively associated with seed
abundance and with all four diversity metrics. Thus, differences between STs in re-use are
expected to result in significant differences in species turnover (i.e. increasing β -diversity)
between STs. Moreover, because the spider monkey shows high selectivity towards the

1
2
3
4 consumption of a few genera of plants (Chapman 1988, Milton 1980, Russo *et al.* 2005)
5
6 and a large number of species are used opportunistically (González-Zamora *et al.* 2009,
7
8 Russo *et al.* 2005), we predicted STF to be negatively associated with community evenness
9
10 (i.e. with higher STF the seed rain will be dominated by a fewer species).
11
12
13
14
15

16 METHODS

17 Study sites

18
19 The Lacandona rain forest constitutes the south-western sector of the Mayan forest in
20
21 Mexico, and represents a priority area for biodiversity conservation in Mexico and
22
23 Mesoamerica (Myers *et al.* 2000). The area is located in the north-eastern portion of the
24
25 state of Chiapas, and is delimited by the Guatemalan border on the south and east, and by
26
27 the Chiapas highlands on the north and west. Annual precipitation averages 2850 mm, and
28
29 average monthly temperatures range between 24°C and 26°C. This region was originally
30
31 covered by over 1.4 million ha of rain forest, but deforestation between 1960 and 1990
32
33 resulted in the loss of 70% of the original forest cover (Arizpe *et al.* 1993).
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 Within this region the Montes Azules Biosphere Reserve (MABR) was created in
41
42 1978 to protect biodiversity. Adjacent to the southern extreme of MABR, the Marqués de
43
44 Comillas Region (MCR) was colonized by humans about 40 y ago and since then MCR has
45
46 suffered the rapid loss and fragmentation of the original rain forest (Mora 2008). Currently,
47
48 MCR is dominated by different-sized rain forest patches, embedded in a matrix of cattle
49
50 pastures, agricultural lands (e.g. corn, oil palm, rubber) and human settlements. The study
51
52 was conducted in MCR (eastern side of the Lacantún River; 2039 km²) and MABR
53
54 (western side; 3312 km²).
55
56
57
58
59
60

Experimental design

Based on a recent study on the density and spatial distribution of sleeping sites, STs and latrines of the spider monkey (*Ateles geoffroyi*) in the region (González-Zamora *et al.* 2012, 2014), we selected 60 sleeping sites, each composed by one single ST, in two continuous-forest sites within MABR and three forest fragments in MCR (12 STs per study site). To increase the independence between the two continuous-forest sites, they were separated by 5 km from each other. The forest fragments FF1, FF2 and FF3 have an area of 1125, 33 and 30 ha, respectively, and were isolated ≥ 24 y ago and were immersed in an anthropogenic matrix of pastures and agricultural lands. The average distance between two fragments was 4.2 km (see further details in Gonzalez-Zamora *et al.* 2012, 2014). We do not have accurate information on the home range, population size/density and core area size of each primate's community. Yet a recent study in the same study sites reports that FF1 is occupied by a community of approximately 40 spider monkeys using a home range of 63 ha, whereas the communities from FF2 and FF3 have 30 and 39 individuals, respectively, and use the entire fragment area (Chaves *et al.* 2012). The average home-range size and community size in the continuous forest of the Lacandona rain forest is 68.4 ha and 40 individuals (Chaves *et al.* 2012). Unfortunately, we do not have data about the size of core areas in the study sites, but in Santa Rosa National Park, Costa Rica, Asensio *et al.* (2012b) estimated that spider monkeys use five core areas of 9.2 ha on average (range = 3.4–19.2 ha) that totalled 46.1 ha out of the 304 ha of the entire home range.

Seed-rain patterns

1
2
3
4 Each selected ST had a single latrine (Gonzalez-Zamora *et al.* 2012, 2014). The STs had a
5 mean crown projection of approximately $21 \pm 21 \text{ m}^2$ (mean \pm SD). This indicates that each
6 trap covered ca. 3% of the tree crown. Nevertheless, because we located the trap in the
7 centre of the latrine, which had an average a diameter of 1.5 m (González-Zamora *et al.*
8 2014), each trap covered approximately 60% of the latrine's area. Traps consisted of a
9 circular 1.5-m-diameter PVC frame supporting a 0.5-m-deep open-topped nylon mesh bag
10 suspended 1 m above the ground on three steel posts to prevent the possible predation of
11 seeds by terrestrial vertebrates. In fact, we did not detect signs of seed predation (i.e. open
12 husks, teeth marks) in the dispersed seed pool. Although seed traps also captured some
13 fruits and seeds dispersed by wind or gravity, and would also capture seed dispersed by bird
14 and bats, we only considered seeds completely immersed within monkey faeces. These
15 seeds were easily identified in the field based on their typically stained appearance and
16 characteristic adhesion of faecal matter (González-Zamora *et al.* 2014), thus limiting
17 greatly the erroneous inclusion of seeds dispersed by wind, gravity, or other animals.
18 Furthermore, we did not consider seeds $< 5 \text{ mm}$ in length, which are known to be dispersed
19 by a wider variety of seed dispersers, including small-to-medium terrestrial mammals, bats
20 and birds (Janson 1983, Stoner *et al.* 2007), whereas seeds $\geq 5 \text{ mm}$ in length are frequently
21 dispersed by primates (Arroyo-Rodríguez *et al.* 2015, Chaves *et al.* 2011, González-
22 Zamora *et al.* 2014).

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 During a 13-mo period (1 February 2011-28 February 2012) each trap was emptied
50 once monthly, and the seeds were collected and afterwards washed for subsequent
51 identification in the laboratory. All seeds were counted and identified to the species level
52 based on (1) our own experience with the local flora (from seeds to adults) (Chaves *et al.*
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 2011, 2012; González-Zamora *et al.* 2012); (2) assistance from a botanical expert familiar
5
6 with the flora of the region (G. Ibarra-Manríquez, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de
7
8 México, Morelia, Mexico) and a local parataxonomist; and (3) information from seed
9
10 catalogues (Ibarra-Manríquez & Cornejo-Tenorio 2010).
11
12
13

16 **Sleeping-tree fidelity**

17
18 Following Reichard (1998), STF was defined as the number of months each ST was used
19
20 during the study period. Given that all traps were checked at the end of each month, the
21
22 presence of faeces in the traps was used as an indicator of sleeping-tree use by spider
23
24 monkeys during that month. Since all traps were completely emptied each month, we
25
26 considered both fresh and old faeces as indicators of sleeping-tree use, thus avoiding the
27
28 possibility of overestimating STF. Although our definition of STF does not reflect
29
30 accurately the intensity of use of STs (i.e. it would be better to assess STF on a daily or
31
32 weekly basis), our results suggest however that our assessment of STF is an appropriate
33
34 approximation of the intensity of use, as all community attributes of the seed rain were
35
36 significantly related to STF.
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 **Sample completeness**

47
48 To assess the sample completeness within each ST, we employed the coverage estimator
49
50 (\hat{C}_n) suggested by Chao & Jost (2012), which is a less biased estimator of sample
51
52 completeness:
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

$$\hat{C}_n = 1 - \frac{f_1}{n} \left[\frac{(n-1)f_1}{(n-1)f_1 + 2f_2} \right]$$

where f_1 and f_2 are the number of species represented by one (singletons) and two (doubletons) individuals in the sample, respectively, and n is the total number of individuals in the sample. Sample completeness did not differ between sites (Kruskal-Wallis test, $H = 6.7$, $P = 0.14$; mean \pm SE: $99\% \pm 1\%$, range: 93%-100% per ST). This indicates that the seed sample was accurate with our sampling effort, and that our results are not biased by differences in sample completeness among sites (Chao & Jost 2012).

Composition and structure of seed assemblages

Based on our hierarchically nested sampling design (i.e. 60 STs in five sites within two forest types), we calculated the total abundance and species diversity of seeds for each ST during the 13-mo period. Patterns of species diversity were analyzed using true diversity measures (i.e. number equivalents, qD). This analytical approach has been recognized as the most appropriate for diversity comparisons (Chao *et al.* 2012, Jost 2006, 2007; Tuomisto 2010). The formulas are detailed elsewhere (Chao *et al.* 2012, Jost 2006). We considered true diversities 0D (species richness), 1D (exponential of Shannon's entropy) and 2D (inverse Simpson concentration). 0D is not sensitive to species abundances and so gives disproportionate weight to rare species (Jost 2006, Tuomisto 2010). 1D weights each species according to its abundance in the community, and therefore can be interpreted as the number of 'common' (or typical) species in the community (Chao *et al.* 2012). Finally, 2D favours very abundant species, and can be interpreted as the number of 'dominant' species in the community (Chao *et al.* 2012, Jost 2010). These three diversity measures

1
2
3
4 were calculated using raw estimators with the ‘entropart’ package for R (v. 3.1.1) (R Core
5 Team Development).
6
7

8
9 We also assessed differences in species dominance among latrines using the evenness
10 factor proposed by Jost (2010): $EF_{0,2} = {}^2D/{}^0D$. We used this measure because: (1) it is
11 calculated from true diversity measures; (2) it is independent of the number of species in
12 the sample; and (3) it is very easy to interpret. It ranges between 1 (when all species are
13 equally common) and nearly $1/{}^0D$ (when the community is totally dominated by one
14 species), and can be interpreted as the proportion of dominant species in the community
15 (Jost 2010).
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 **Statistical analyses**

29
30 To assess whether STs can be considered independent samples, we used Mantel tests to
31 correlate the distance between STs with the difference in STF (i.e. differences in the re-use
32 of different STs). The P-values were calculated using the distribution of the R coefficients
33 obtained from 10000 permutations. Because the Mantel tests did not detect a significant
34 spatial autocorrelation of data sets within the continuous forest sites (CF1: $r = -0.23$, $P =$
35 0.05 ; CF2: $r = -0.16$, $P = 0.17$), nor within the forest fragments (FF1: $r = 0.14$, $P = 0.24$;
36 FF2: $r = 0.02$, $P = 0.87$; FF3: $r = 0.10$, $P = 0.41$), we considered the STs as replicates in the
37 following analyses.
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 We first tested for differences in STF among sites and between forest types using
51 analyses of deviance (ANODE) with generalized linear models (GLM). As suggested for
52 count dependent variables (i.e. number of months), we used a Poisson error and a log link
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 function, and corrected for data overdispersion (Crawley 2002). We then used analyses of
5
6 covariance (ANCOVA) with GLMs to assess the association between each community-
7
8 level variable (abundance of seeds, 0D , 1D , 2D , and EF ; the dependent variable) and forest
9
10 type (categorical factor) and STF (continuous cofactor). The interaction of these two
11
12 explanatory variables (forest type \times STF) was included in the models to test if the slope of
13
14 the association between each response variable and STF differed between forest types. We
15
16 also used Mantel tests to evaluate if seed species turnover between STs within each
17
18 sampling site was related to the differences between STs in STF. The species turnover
19
20 between STs was calculated using multiplicative diversity decomposition of Hill numbers:
21
22 ${}^qD_\beta = {}^qD_\gamma / {}^qD_\alpha$ (Jost 2007). These metrics were calculated using the ‘entropart’ package for
23
24 R (<<http://CRAN.R-project.org/package=entropart>>.) to implement a function to construct
25
26 a matrix containing β -diversity values of each pairwise comparison within each sampling
27
28 site. Thus, for each ST pair, ${}^qD_\gamma$ was the total (gamma) diversity of the two STs, and ${}^qD_\alpha$
29
30 was the average alpha diversity per ST. This beta can be interpreted as ‘effective number of
31
32 completely distinct communities’ (Jost 2007). In our case, it ranged between 1 (when both
33
34 STs showed identical seed rains) and 2 (when the two STs were completely different from
35
36 each other).
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

47 RESULTS

48 **Sleeping-tree fidelity in continuous and fragmented forests**

49
50 Overall, STF of spider monkeys was highly variable among sites. It ranged from 3 to 10 mo
51
52 in continuous forest sites, and from 1 to 12 mo in forest fragments, but it did not differ
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 among sites (GLM; $\chi^2 = 5.55$, $df = 4$, $P = 0.23$; Figure 1a) or between forest types ($\chi^2 =$
5
6
7 0.56, $df = 1$, $P = 0.45$; Figure 1b).
8
9

10 11 **Association between STF and seed-rain patterns**

12
13
14 The generalized linear models showed that STF was positively related to all community
15
16 attributes of the seed rain (Table 1; Figure 2). The interaction in the models (forest type \times
17
18 STF) was not significant, indicating that this positive association was similar in both
19
20 continuous and fragmented forests (Figure 2).
21
22

23
24 The Mantel tests showed that, in the smallest forest fragments (FF2 and FF3), species
25
26 turnover of seeds among STs increased with increasing inter-ST differences in STF (Table
27
28 2). This association was also significant in FF1, but only when considering β -diversity of
29
30 order 0 and 1 (i.e. ${}^0D_\beta$ and ${}^1D_\beta$). Yet, the Mantel tests did not detect a significant correlation
31
32 between inter-ST differences in STF and β -diversity for all order q (Table 2).
33
34
35
36
37

38 **DISCUSSION**

39
40 Contrary to our prediction, STF was similar in all study sites and did not differ between
41
42 continuous and fragmented forests. This was due to the large variation among STs.
43

44
45 Although STs were used by spider monkeys on average for 7 out of 13 mo, there was a
46
47 substantial variation across trees (range = 1-12 mo), which was relatively higher in forest
48
49 fragments than in continuous forest sites (Figure 1). Previous studies on the spider monkey
50
51 (Chapman *et al.* 1989, Russo & Augspurger 2004, Russo *et al.* 2006) and other primate
52
53 species (*Brachyteles arachnoides*: Bueno *et al.* 2013; *Hylobates lar*: Reichard 1998;
54
55
56 *Gorilla gorilla*: Rogers *et al.* 1998; *Lagothrix lagothricha*: Stevenson 2000) also indicated
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 that the use and re-use of STs can be highly variable, with some trees used for long periods,
5
6 while others only used occasionally (Anderson 1984, 2000; Reichard 1998, Teichroeb *et al.*
7
8 2012). In the case of the spider monkey, this pattern results from its temporal and spatial
9
10 foraging behaviour in different areas with a high concentration of food trees within the
11
12 home range (Asensio *et al.* 2012b, Ramos-Fernández *et al.* 2013), and then routinely
13
14 returning at night to the same or different STs located in proximity to these areas with
15
16 greater food density (i.e. multiple central-place foraging; *sensu* Chapman *et al.* 1989). This
17
18 behaviour allows the monkey to monitor the resources for future usage (Asensio *et al.*
19
20 2012a) and to move back to its STs using route-based mental maps (Di Fiore & Suarez
21
22 2007, Ramos-Fernández *et al.* 2004, Suarez *et al.* 2014), thus minimizing travel time
23
24 (Asensio *et al.* 2012b, Chapman 1989, Teichroeb *et al.* 2012). Yet, during territorial
25
26 defence (Chapman *et al.* 1995, Wallace 2008), or exploration to monitor feeding sites at a
27
28 great distance (Di Fiore & Suarez 2007, Ramos-Fernández *et al.* 2004, Valero & Byrne
29
30 2007) males of *A. Geoffroyi* can use STs for short periods because they usually do not return
31
32 to the same ST (Ramos-Fernández *et al.* 2004), possibly explaining the low fidelity found
33
34 for some STs in our study. Therefore, as reported for other primate species (Heymann
35
36 1995, Pontes & Soares 2005, Reichard 1998, Sigg & Stolba 1981, Silva Júnior *et al.* 2009,
37
38 Smith *et al.* 2007), the high variation in STF in the Lacandona rain forest is most likely
39
40 related to the spatial and temporal changes in the concentration and distribution of food
41
42 resources and sex differences in the use of space by the spider monkey.
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

52 The relatively higher variation in STF in forest fragments than in continuous forest
53
54 sites can be related to food scarcity in forest fragments (Arroyo-Rodríguez & Mandujano
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 2006, Chaves *et al.* 2012). In particular, fruit availability is known to be lower in forest
5
6 fragments than in continuous forest because of the combination of both a lower density of
7
8 large food trees (dbh > 60 cm), which represent larger fruit patches (Chapman *et al.* 1992),
9
10 and smaller home-range sizes in fragments (Chaves *et al.* 2012). Thus, the spatial variation
11
12 in resource availability is expected to be higher in forest fragments than in continuous
13
14 forest. As consequence, in forest fragments, the STs that are located in areas with higher
15
16 availability of resources would be used relatively more often than in continuous forest sites,
17
18 whereas the STs that are located in areas with lower availability of resources would be used
19
20 relatively less intensively than in continuous forest sites. Consistent with this idea, we
21
22 found that in forest fragments 15 out of 36 STs were used for 9-12 mo and five were only
23
24 used for 1-3 mo. In continuous forest, however, all STs were used for between 3 and 10 mo
25
26 (Figure 1).
27
28
29
30
31

32
33
34 The lower variation in STF in continuous than in fragmented forest can explain why
35
36 seed β -diversity between STs did not increase with increasing inter-tree differences in STF
37
38 in continuous forest sites. It is well known that the lack of variation in explanatory variables
39
40 (STF in our case) result in weaker associations between explanatory and response variables
41
42 (species turnover in our case) (Eigenbrod *et al.* 2011). As discussed above, the lower
43
44 variation in STF in continuous forest sites may be associated with higher availability of
45
46 resources in this sites when compared to the smallest fragments, which in turn can
47
48 contribute to reduce β -diversity between STs within the continuous forest. In contrast,
49
50 higher spatial variations in the availability of food resources may contribute to increase the
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 differences in STF in fragments, and also to significant compositional differentiations in
5
6 seed assemblages between sleeping trees (González-Zamora *et al.* 2014).
7
8
9

10 In agreement with our predictions, STF was positively related to the abundance and
11
12 species diversity of seeds in all sites, indicating that the more often a ST is used, the more
13
14 seeds from a larger variety of species are deposited under it. Such associations can be
15
16 explained by the changes in the frugivorous diet along the year (Chaves *et al.* 2012,
17
18 González-Zamora *et al.* 2014) and by the spatial location of the STs in relation to foraging
19
20 routes used by spider monkeys (Di Fiore & Suarez 2007, Suarez 2003, Suarez *et al.* 2014),
21
22 resulting in an increase in the abundance and species diversity of seeds. In conclusion, our
23
24 results suggest that the spatial configuration of seed communities deposited in latrines
25
26 depends on the specific location of STs in foraging paths (Di Fiore & Suarez 2007), and by
27
28 the spatial and temporal variation in territory quality (Asensio *et al.* 2012a,b).
29
30
31
32
33

34 STF was negatively related to community evenness in all study sites. As expected,
35
36 this finding can be related to the fact that the the seeds in the latrines below more frequently
37
38 used STs reflect the common feeding pattern of the species, i.e. there is a high selectivity
39
40 towards the consumption of a few genera of plants (Chapman 1988, Milton 1980, Russo *et*
41
42 *al.* 2005) and the opportunistic use of a large number of other fruit species (Dew 2008,
43
44 González-Zamora *et al.* 2009, Link *et al.* 2012, Nunes 1998, Russo *et al.* 2005), thus
45
46 reducing the number of common and dominant species, as well as the seed community
47
48 evenness.
49
50
51
52
53
54
55

56 **Conclusions and implications for seed dispersal**

57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 Our study demonstrates that STF is a key factor shaping the seed-rain patterns produced by
5 the spider monkey below STs. Therefore, changes in STF (e.g. those associated with
6 logging or habitat fragmentation) could have important implications for seed dispersal and
7 forest regeneration. Of course, this constitutes a very important avenue for future research,
8 as we still do not have data on seed germination, and seedling recruitment and growth in
9 and around spider monkey latrines differing in re-use.
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18

19 Although we found no differences in STF between continuous and fragmented
20 forests, further studies in highly fragmented landscapes are required to accurately test if
21 STF can be altered in more fragmented landscapes. Deforestation in the study region is
22 moderate (ca. 40% of remaining forest cover), and forest remnants still maintain most of
23 their original vegetation composition and structure (Hernández-Ruedas *et al.* 2014), which
24 may contributed to the apparent lack of differences in STF between forest types.
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

34 If STF is higher in fragmented forests, our results indicate that the effectiveness of the
35 spider monkey as a seed disperser (*sensu* Schupp 1993) would change as a result of the
36 increased aggregation of seeds in latrines found in our study. Nevertheless, this will depend
37 on the impact that such increase in seed/seedling aggregation has on seed germination and
38 seedling recruitment. We can anticipate two alternative scenarios. First, because we found
39 that STF is negatively related to community evenness, higher STF would result in a seed
40 rain dominated by a few seed species. Thus, based on the Janzen-Connell model (Connell
41 1971, Janzen 1970), we would expect higher seed predation (e.g. by rodents, insects, and/or
42 pathogens) toward the most dominant species, which could reduce predation pressure on
43 less abundant species allowing the recruitment of rare species in latrines that are more
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 frequently used. Second, an alternative scenario suggests that the low rate of seed arrival in
5
6 STs less frequently used may allow seeds to avoid the presence of biotic mortality agents,
7
8 offsetting the lower seed/seedling survival that is expected in such conditions (Bravo 2012,
9
10 Russo & Augspurger 2004). Since the seed community structure and composition can be
11
12 decisive for the initial stages of recruitment (Russo & Augspurger 2004, Schupp *et al.*
13
14 2010, Wang & Smith 2002), our results call for further studies to assess the persistence of
15
16 seeds and recruitment of seedlings under different levels of evenness in the seed bank of
17
18 latrines and to determine which of these two scenarios occurs with increasing STF.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

27
28 We are grateful to Sabrina Russo and two anonymous reviewers for the constructive
29
30 comments on an earlier version of this manuscript. This research was funded by the
31
32 Consejo Nacional de Ciencia y Tecnología, CONACyT grants (CB-2005-51043 and CB-
33
34 2006-56799) and the Dirección General de Asuntos del Personal Académico, DGAPA,
35
36 Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, UNAM (project IA-203111). AGZ thanks the
37
38 scholarship (Apoyos Complementarios para la Consolidación Institucional de Grupos de
39
40 Investigación) provided by CONACyT. KS thanks the UC MEXUS project. We thank
41
42 Rafael Lombera and Ana M. Gonzalez-Di Pierro for their invaluable help in the field. The
43
44 Instituto de Investigaciones Biológicas, UV, and Instituto de Investigaciones en
45
46 Ecosistemas y Sustentabilidad, UNAM, provided logistical support. This study would not
47
48 have been possible without the collaboration of Natura y Ecosistemas Mexicanos A.C. and
49
50 the local people in Chajul, Reforma Agraria, and Zamora Pico de Oro ejidos. We are
51
52 grateful to M. Lobato, H. Ferreira, A. Valencia, and A. Lopez for technical support.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

LITERATURE CITED

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 ANDERSON, J. R. 1984. Ethology and ecology of sleep in monkeys and apes. *Advances in*
10
11 *the Study of Behavior* 14:166–229.
12
13 ANDERSON, J. R. 2000. Sleep-related behavioural adaptations in free ranging anthropoid
14
15 primates. *Sleep Medicine Reviews* 4:355–373.
16
17
18 ARIZPE, L., PAZ, F. & VELÁZQUEZ, M. 1993. Cultura y cambio global: percepciones
19
20 sociales sobre la deforestación en la Selva Lacandona. Pp. 69–89 in Miguel, A. P.
21
22 (ed.). *La selva Lacandona: tierra de nadie, tierra de todos*. Centro Regional de
23
24 Investigaciones Multidisciplinarias, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México,
25
26 Mexico City.
27
28
29
30 ARROYO-RODRÍGUEZ, V. & MANDUJANO, S. 2006. Forest fragmentation modifies
31
32 habitat quality for *Alouatta palliata*. *International Journal of Primatology* 27:1079–
33
34 1096.
35
36
37 ARROYO-RODRÍGUEZ, V., ANDRESEN, E., BRAVO, S. P. & STEVENSON, P. R.
38
39 2015. Seed dispersal by howler monkeys: current knowledge, conservation
40
41 implications and future directions. Pp. 111-139 in Kowalewski, M., Garber, P. A.,
42
43 Cortés-Ortiz, L., Urbani, B. & Youlatos, D. (eds.). *Howler monkeys: behavior,*
44
45 *ecology and conservation*. Springer, New York.
46
47
48
49 ASENSIO, N., SCHAFFNER, C. M. & AURELI, F. 2012a. Variability in core areas of
50
51 spider monkeys (*Ateles geoffroyi*) in a tropical dry forest in Costa Rica. *Primates*
52
53 53:147–156.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4 ASENSIO, N., LUSSEAU, D., SCHAFFNER, C. M. & AURELI, F. 2012b. Spider
5
6
7 monkeys use high-quality core areas in a tropical dry forest. *Journal of Zoology*
8
9
10 287:250–258.
- 11 BÖRGER, L., DALZIEL, B. D. & FRYXELL, J. M. 2008. Are there general mechanisms
12
13
14 of animal home range behaviour? A review and prospects for future research.
15
16
17 *Ecology Letters* 11:637–650.
- 18 BRAVO, S. P. 2012. The impact of seed dispersal by black and gold howler monkeys on
19
20
21 forest regeneration. *Ecological Research* 27:311–321.
- 22
23
24 BUENO, R. S., GUEVARA, R., RIBEIRO, M. C., CULOT, L., BUFALO, F. S. &
25
26
27 GALETTI, M. 2013. Functional redundancy and complementarities of seed dispersal
28
29
30 by the last Neotropical megafrugivores. *PLoS ONE* 8:e56252.
- 31
32
33 CHAPMAN, C. A. 1988. Patterns of foraging and range use by three species of Neotropical
34
35
36 primates. *Primates* 29:177–194.
- 37
38
39 CHAPMAN, C. A. 1989. Spider monkey sleeping sites: use and availability. *American*
40
41
42 *Journal of Primatology* 18:53–60.
- 43
44
45 CHAPMAN, C. A., CHAPMAN, L. J. & MCLAUGHLIN, R. L. 1989. Multiple central
46
47
48 place foraging by spider monkeys: travel consequences of using many sleeping sites.
49
50
51 *Oecologia* 79:506–511.
- 52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60 CHAPMAN, C. A., CHAPMAN, L. J., WRANGHAM, R., HUNT, K., GEBBO, D. &
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
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
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

- 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
- CHAPMAN, C. A., WRANGHAM, R. W. & CHAPMAN, L. J. 1995. Ecological constraints on group size: an analysis of spider monkey and chimpanzee subgroups. *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology* 36:59–70.
- CHAO, A. & JOST, L. 2012. Coverage-based rarefaction and extrapolation: standardizing samples by completeness rather than size. *Ecology* 93:2533–2547.
- CHAO, A., CHIU, C. H. & HSIEH, T. 2012. Proposing a resolution to debates on diversity partitioning. *Ecology* 93:2037–2051.
- CHAVES, O. M., STONER, K. E. & ARROYO-RODRÍGUEZ, V. 2011. Effectiveness of spider monkeys (*Ateles geoffroyi vellerosus*) as seed dispersers in continuous and fragmented rainforests in southern Mexico. *International Journal of Primatology* 32:177–192.
- CHAVES, O. M., STONER, K. E. & ARROYO-RODRÍGUEZ, V. 2012. Differences in diet between spider monkey groups living in forest fragments and continuous forest in Lacandona, Mexico. *Biotropica* 44:105–113.
- CRAWLEY, M. 2002. *Statistical computing: an introduction to data analysis using S-Plus*. John Wiley & Sons, Chichester. 772 pp.
- CONNELL, J. H. 1971. On the role of natural enemies in preventing competitive exclusion in some marine animals and in rain forest trees. Pp. 298–312 in den Boer, P. J. & Gradwell, G. R. (eds.). *Dynamics of populations*. Center for Agricultural Publication and Documentation, Wageningen.
- DEW, J. L. 2008. Spider monkeys as seed dispersers. Pp. 155–182 in Campbell, C. J. (ed.) *Spider monkeys. The biology, behavior and ecology of the genus Ateles*. Cambridge University Press, New York.

- 1
2
3
4 EIGENBROD, F., HECNAR, S. J. & FAHRIG, L. 2011. Sub-optimal study design has
5
6 major impacts on landscape-scale inference. *Biological Conservation* 144:298-305.
7
8
9 DI FIORE, A. & SUAREZ, S. A. 2007. Route-based travel and shared routes in sympatric
10
11 spider and woolly monkeys: cognitive and evolutionary implications. *Animal*
12
13 *Cognition* 10:317–329.
14
15
16 GONZÁLEZ-ZAMORA, A., ARROYO-RODRÍGUEZ, V., CHAVES, O. M., SÁNCHEZ-
17
18 LÓPEZ, S. & STONER, K. E. 2009. Diet of spider monkeys (*Ateles geoffroyi*) in
19
20 Mesoamerica: current knowledge and future directions. *American Journal of*
21
22 *Primatology* 71:8–20.
23
24
25 GONZÁLEZ-ZAMORA, A., ARROYO-RODRÍGUEZ, V., OYAMA, K., SORK, V.,
26
27 CHAPMAN, C. A. & STONER, K. E. 2012. Sleeping sites and latrines of spider
28
29 monkeys in continuous and fragmented rainforests: implications for seed dispersal
30
31 and forest regeneration. *PLoS ONE* 7:e46852.
32
33
34 GONZÁLEZ-ZAMORA, A., ARROYO-RODRÍGUEZ, V., ESCOBAR, F., RÖS, M.,
35
36 OYAMA, K., IBARRA-MANRÍQUEZ, G. & STONER, K. E. 2014. Contagious
37
38 deposition of seeds in spider monkeys' sleeping trees limits effective seed dispersal in
39
40 fragmented landscapes *PLoS ONE* 9(2): e89346.
41
42
43
44 HERNÁNDEZ-RUEDAS, M. A., ARROYO-RODRÍGUEZ, V., MEAVE, J. A.,
45
46 MARTÍNEZ-RAMOS, M., IBARRA-MANRÍQUEZ, I., MARTÍNEZ, E.,
47
48 JAMANGAPE, J., MELO, F. P. L. & SANTOS, B. A. 2014. Conserving tropical tree
49
50 diversity and forest structure: the value of small rainforest patches in moderately-
51
52 managed landscapes. *PLoS ONE* 9(6): e98931.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4 HEYMANN, E. W. 1995. Sleeping habits of tamarins, *Saguinus mystax* and *Saguinus*
5
6
7 *fuscicollis* (Mammalia; Primates; Callitrichidae), in north-eastern Peru. *Journal of*
8
9 *Zoology* 237:211–226.
- 10
11 IBARRA-MANRÍQUEZ, G. & CORNEJO-TENORIO, G. 2010. Diversidad de frutos de
12
13 los árboles del bosque tropical pefennifolio de México. *Acta Botánica Mexicana*
14
15 90:51–104.
- 16
17
18 JANSON, C. H. 1983. Adaptation of fruit morphology to dispersal agents in a Neotropical
19
20 forest. *Science* 219:187–189.
- 21
22
23 JANZEN, D. H. 1970. Herbivores and the number of tree species in tropical forests.
24
25
26 *American Naturalist* 104:501–528.
- 27
28 JORDANO, P. 1992. Fruits and frugivory. Pp. 105–156 in Fenner, M. (ed.). *Seeds: the*
29
30 *ecology of regeneration in plant communities*. CAB International, Wallingford.
- 31
32
33 JORDANO, P. & SCHUPP, E. W. 2000. Seed disperser effectiveness: the quantity
34
35 component and patterns of seed rain for *Prunus mahaleb*. *Ecological Monographs*
36
37 70:591–615.
- 38
39
40 JOST, L. 2006. Entropy and diversity. *Oikos* 113:363–375.
- 41
42
43 JOST, L. 2007. Partitioning diversity into independent alpha and beta components. *Ecology*
44
45 88:2427–2439.
- 46
47
48 JOST, L. 2010. The relation between evenness and diversity. *Diversity* 2:207–232.
- 49
50 LINK, A., GALVIS, N., MARQUEZ, M., GUERRERO, J., SOLANO, C. &
51
52 STEVENSON, P. R. 2012. Diet of the critically endangered brown spider monkey
53
54 (*Ateles hybridus*) in an inter-andean lowland rainforest in Colombia. *American*
55
56 *Journal of Primatology* 74:1097–1105.
- 57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4 MILTON, K. 1980. *The foraging strategy of howler monkeys: a study in primate*
5
6 *economics*. Columbia University Press, New York. 165 pp.
7
8
- 9 MORA, F. 2008. Caracterización de la cobertura forestal en el Corredor Biológico
10
11 Mesoamericano-México: patrones espaciales en la pérdida y fragmentación de
12
13 bosques. Pp. 55–83 in Comisión Nacional para el Conocimiento y Uso de la
14
15 Biodiversidad (CONABIO). *Importancia del capital ecológico de la región Corredor*
16
17 *Biológico Mesoamericano-México*. Centro de Investigación en Geografía y
18
19 Geomática, CentroGEO, Mexico City.
20
21
- 22 MYERS, N., MITTERMEIER, R. A., MITTERMEIER, C. G., DA FONSECA, G. A. &
23
24 KENT, J. 2000. Biodiversity hotspots for conservation priorities. *Nature* 403:853–
25
26 858.
27
28
- 29 NUNES, A. 1998. Diet and feeding ecology of *Ateles belzebuth* at Maracá ecological
30
31 station, Roraima, Brasil. *Folia Primatologica* 69:61–76.
32
33
- 34 PONTES, A. R. & SOARES, M. 2005. Sleeping sites of common marmosets (*Callithrix*
35
36 *jacchus*) in defaunated urban forest fragments: a strategy to maxime food intake.
37
38 *Journal of Zoology* 26:55–63.
39
40
- 41 RAMOS-FERNÁNDEZ, G. & WALLACE, R. B. 2008. Spider monkey conservation in the
42
43 twenty-first century: recognizing risks and opportunities. Pp. 351–372 in Campbell, J.
44
45 C. (ed.). *Spider monkeys. The biology, behavior and ecology of the genus Ateles*.
46
47 Cambridge University Press, New York.
48
49
- 50 RAMOS-FERNÁNDEZ, G., MATEOS, J. L., MIRAMONTES, O., LARRALDE, H.,
51
52 COCHO, G. & AYALA-OROZCO, B. 2004. Lévy walk patterns in the foraging
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4 movements of spider monkeys (*Ateles geoffroyi*). *Behavioral Ecology and*
5
6 *Sociobiology* 55:223–230.
7
8
9 RAMOS-FERNÁNDEZ, G., SMITH AGUILAR, S. E., SCHAFFNER, C. M., VICK, L. G.
10
11 & AURELI, F. 2013. Site fidelity in space use by spider monkeys (*Ateles geoffroyi*)
12
13 in the Yucatan Peninsula, Mexico. *PLoS ONE* 8:e62813.
14
15
16 REICHARD, U. 1998. Sleeping sites, sleeping places, and presleep behavior of gibbons
17
18 (*Hylobates lar*). *American Journal of Primatology* 46:35–62.
19
20
21 ROGERS, M. E., VOYSEY, B. C., MCDONALD, K. E., PARNELL, R. J. & TUTIN, C. E.
22
23 G. 1998. Lowland gorillas and seed dispersal: the importance of nest sites. *American*
24
25 *Journal of Primatology* 45:45–68.
26
27
28 RUSSO, S. E. & AUGSPURGER, C. K. 2004. Aggregated seed dispersal by spider
29
30 monkeys limits recruitment to clumped patterns in *Virola calophylla*. *Ecology Letters*
31
32 7:1058–1067.
33
34
35 RUSSO, S. E., CAMPBELL, C. J., DEW, L., STEVENSON, P. R. & SUAREZ, S. A.
36
37 2005. A multi-forest comparison of dietary preferences and seed dispersal by *Ateles*
38
39 spp. *International Journal of Primatology* 26:1017–1037.
40
41
42 RUSSO, S. E., PORTNOY, S. & AUGSPURGER, C. K. 2006. Incorporating animal
43
44 behavior into seed dispersal models: implications for seed shadows. *Ecology*
45
46 87:3160–3174.
47
48
49 SCHUPP, E. W. 1993. Quantity, quality and the effectiveness of seed dispersal by animals.
50
51 *Vegetatio* 107:15–29.
52
53
54 SCHUPP, E. W., JORDANO, P. & GÓMEZ, J. M. 2010. Seed dispersal effectiveness
55
56 revisited: a conceptual review. *New Phytologist* 188:333–353.
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4 SIGG, H. & STOLBA, A. 1981. Home range use and daily march in a hamadryas baboon
5
6 troop. *Folia Primatologica* 36:40–75.
7
8
- 9 SILVA JÚNIOR, W. M., MEIRA-NETO, J. A. A., DA SILVA FLÁVIA, M. C.,
10
11 RODRIGUES DE MELO, F., SANTANA MOREIRA, L., FERREIRA BARBOSA,
12
13 E., DIAS, L. G. & SILVA PERES, C. A. 2009. Habitat quality of the woolly spider
14
15 monkey. *Folia Primatologica* 80:295–308.
16
17
- 18 STONER, K. E., RIBA-HERNÁNDEZ, P., VULINEC, K. & LAMBERT, J. E. 2007. The
19
20 role of mammals in creating and modifying seedshadows in tropical forests and some
21
22 possible consequences of their elimination. *Biotropica* 39:316–327.
23
24
- 25 SUAREZ, S. A. 2003. *Spatio-temporal foraging skills of white-bellied spider monkeys*
26
27 *(Ateles belzebuth belzebuth) in the Yasuni National Park, Ecuador*. Doctoral
28
29 dissertation, State University of New York at Stony Brook, Stony Brook.
30
31
- 32 SUAREZ, S. A., KARRO, JOHN., KIPER, J., FARLER, D., MCELROY, B., ROGERS, B.
33
34 C., STOCKWELL, B. & TAYLOR, Y. 2014. A comparison of computer-generated
35
36 and naturally occurring foraging patterns in route-network-constrained spider
37
38 monkeys. *American Journal of Primatology* 76:460–471.
39
40
41
- 42 SMITH, A. C., KNOGGE, C., HUCK, M., LÖTTKER, P., BUCHANAN-SMITH, H. M. &
43
44 HEYMANN, E. W. 2007. Long term patterns of sleeping site use in wild saddleback
45
46 *(Saguinus fuscicollis)* and mustached tamarins (*S. mystax*). *American Journal of*
47
48 *Physical Anthropology* 134:340–353.
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4 STEVENSON, P. R. 2000. Seed dispersal by woolly monkeys (*Lagothrix lagothricha*) at
5
6 Tinigua National Park, Colombia: dispersal distance, germination rates, and dispersal
7
8 quantity. *American Journal of Primatology* 50:275–289.
9
10
11 TEICHROEB, J. A., HOLMES, J. A. & SICOTTE, P. 2012. Use of sleeping trees by ursine
12
13 colobus monkeys (*Colobus vellerosus*) demonstrates the importance of nearby food.
14
15 *Primates* 53:287–296.
16
17
18 TUOMISTO, H. 2010. A diversity of beta diversities: straightening up a concept gone
19
20 awry. Part 1. Defining beta diversity as a function of alpha and gamma diversity.
21
22 *Ecography* 33:2–22.
23
24
25 VALERO, A. & BYRNE, R. W. 2007. Spider monkey ranging patterns in Mexican
26
27 subtropical forest: do travel routes reflect planning? *Animal Cognition* 10:305–315.
28
29
30 WALLACE, R. B. 2008. Towing the party line: territoriality, risky boundaries and male
31
32 group size in spider monkey fission–fusion societies. *American Journal of*
33
34 *Primatology* 70:271–281.
35
36
37 WANG, B. C. & SMITH, T. B. 2002. Closing the seed dispersal loop. *Trends in Ecology*
38
39 *and Evolution* 17:379–385.
40
41
42 WENNY, D. G. 2001. Advantages of seed dispersal: a re-evaluation of directed dispersal.
43
44 *Evolutionary Ecology Research* 3:51–74.
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 1. Effect of sleeping-tree fidelity (STF) of *Ateles geoffroyi* on five community-level seed-rain patterns produced by this primate below sleeping trees located in two forest types (continuous forest and forest fragments) in the Lacandona rain forest, Mexico. The effect of STF, forest type and the interaction between the two was tested with Generalized Linear Models.

Response variable/factors	df	χ^2	P
Abundance of seeds			
STF	1	31.3	<0.001
Forest type	1	3.91	0.048
Forest type \times STF	1	0.74	0.389
Species richness			
STF	1	40.4	<0.001
Forest type	1	0.01	0.891
Forest type \times STF	1	0.36	0.547
Exponential Shannon entropy			
STF	1	19.4	<0.001
Forest type	1	0.27	0.602
Forest type \times STF	1	0.002	0.963
Inverse Simpson concentration			
STF	1	11.8	<0.001
Forest type	1	1.42	0.233
Forest type \times STF	1	0.44	0.506
Evenness factor			
STF	1	10.6	0.001
Forest type	1	3.33	0.068
Forest type \times STF	1	0.002	0.966

Table 2. Correlations between species β -diversity of seeds between sleeping trees and inter-tree differences in sleeping tree fidelity in two continuous forest sites (CF) and three forest fragments (FF) in the Lacandona rain forest, Mexico. The correlation coefficients were calculated with Mantel tests (* $P < 0.05$; ** $P < 0.001$, after applying a stringent Bonferroni correction to reduce the likelihood of type I statistical errors). ${}^qD_\beta$ represents the species turnover between sleeping trees, considering three orders q (0, 1 and 2), which determine the sensitivity of each β -diversity component to the relative abundances.

β -diversity component	CF1	CF2	FF1	FF2	FF3
${}^0D_\beta$	-0.001	0.182	0.374**	0.542**	0.400**
${}^1D_\beta$	0.003	-0.052	0.244*	0.385**	0.453**
${}^2D_\beta$	0.083	-0.125	0.175	0.302*	0.523**

1
2
3
4
5 **Figure legends**
6
7
8

9 **Figure 1.** Sleeping-tree fidelity of *Ateles geoffroyi* in continuous (CF) and fragmented (FF)
10 forests in the Lacandona region, Mexico. Differences among sites (a) and between forest
11 types (b) are shown.
12
13
14
15

16
17
18
19
20 **Figure 2.** Effects of sleeping-tree fidelity of *Ateles geoffroyi* on five community-level
21 attributes of seed assemblages in continuous (CF) and fragmented forests (FF) in the
22 Lacandona region, Mexico. a) Abundance of seeds, b) Species richness, c) Exponential
23 Shannon's entropy, d) Inverse Simpson concentration and e) Evenness factor.
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




Figure 1




Figure 2