Title: Fungi are more dispersal limited than bacteria among flowers

Authors:

Rachel L. Vannette* Marshall S. McMunn, Griffin W. Hall, Tobias G. Mueller, Ivan

Munkres, Douglas Perry

Department of Entomology and Nematology, University of California Davis

*Corresponding author address and contact information: Department of Entomology and

Nematology, University of California Davis. Phone 530-752-3379, email:

rlvannette@ucdavis.edu

ORCID ID:

https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0447-3468 (RLV)

http://orcid.org/0000-0002-0585-8722 (MM)

https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0747-3890 (IM)

https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6127-3091 (TM)

https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5294-0131 (DP)

Keywords: nectar yeast, plant-microbe, microbial ecology, dispersal, plant-pollinator

interactions

Author contributions: RLV conceived of the field study, performed fieldwork, and

wrote the manuscript. MM and RLV conceived of the thrips dispersal assay and

performed statistical analyses. GH performed field and microbial labwork. MM and DP

performed the thrips dispersal assay. IM analyzed and processed samples for MALDI-

TOF identifications. TM performed dilution plating assays. All authors contributed to

revisions and gave final approval for publication.

Abstract:

Variation in dispersal ability among taxa affects community assembly and biodiversity

maintenance within metacommunities. Although fungi and bacteria frequently coexist,

their relative dispersal abilities are poorly understood. Nectar-inhabiting microbial

communities affect plant reproduction and pollinator behavior, and are excellent models

for studying dispersal of bacteria and fungi in a metacommunity framework. Here, we

assay dispersal ability of common nectar bacteria and fungi in an insect-based dispersal

experiment. We then compare these results to the incidence and abundance of

culturable flower-inhabiting bacteria and fungi within naturally occurring flowers across

two coflowering communities in California across two flowering seasons. Our microbial

dispersal experiment demonstrates that bacteria disperse among habitat patches more

readily than fungi via thrips. Across all flowers, bacterial and fungal incidence and

abundance were positively correlated but bacteria were much more widespread,

suggesting shared dispersal routes or habitat requirements but differences in dispersal

and colonization frequency. The finding that bacteria are more common among flowers

sampled here, in part due to superior insect-mediated dispersal, may have broad

relevance for microbial life-history, community assembly of microbes and plant-

pollinator interactions.

Introduction

Introduction

Variation in dispersal ability among species can affect the composition and function of

individual communities and biodiversity maintenance within metacommunities (Mouquet

and Loreau 2003, Leibold et al. 2004). Dispersal limitation is well-documented for

macro-organisms, and increasing evidence suggests that microbial taxa including fungi

and bacteria can also be dispersal limited (Lindow and Andersen 1996, Peay et al.

2012, Albright and Martiny 2018, Svoboda et al. 2018). Despite the fact that bacteria

and fungi often co-occur within communities, few studies have examined their relative

dispersal abilities (but see Barberán et al. 2015). This gap in understanding is likely due

to challenges in microbial detection, species delimitation using amplicon sequencing,

and limited natural history knowledge of many microorganisms (Kraemer and Boynton

2016), particularly in a community context. As a result, comparisons in dispersal ability

between coexisting bacteria and fungi are rare and limit the ability to predict the relative

importance of dispersal for microbial community ecology and assembly dynamics. In

addition, it is likely that processes underlying microbial community assembly and

dynamics differ from those structuring communities of macroorganisms (Koskella et al.

2017). Characterizing dispersal differences of microbial taxa under realistic conditions is

important to understanding how dispersal may shape microbial community assembly.

The microbial community in floral nectar—a sugar-rich reward that plants provide to

pollinators-- is ecologically important and a tractable model system for comparing

bacterial and fungal dispersal limitation (Chappell and Fukami 2018, Vannette 2020).

The composition of bacteria and fungi in flowers can influence plant reproduction

(Herrera et al. 2013, Schaeffer and Irwin 2014), either directly (Alexander and

Antonovics 1988, Ngugi and Scherm 2006) or indirectly through effects on pollinator

behavior and health (Vannette et al. 2013, Lenaerts et al. 2017, Sobhy et al. 2018).

Bacteria and fungi often co-occur in nectar (Herrera et al. 2009, Fridman et al. 2012)

where they can attain high abundance (Fridman et al. 2012, Tsuji and Fukami 2018).

The bacteria and fungi that grow in nectar are a small subset of the microbial

communities introduced to nectar (Herrera et al. 2010, Belisle et al. 2012, Pozo et al.

2012, Alvarez-Pérez and Herrera 2013) and exhibit traits that may enhance fitness in

nectar environments (Álvarez-Pérez et al. 2012, Pozo et al. 2012, Dhami et al. 2016a).

Despite strong initial environmental filtering, nectar-inhabiting microbial communities are

ideal for examining dispersal limitation for a few reasons. First, communities in nectar

undergo primary succession (Chappell and Fukami 2018). Few culturable microbes are

found in nectar of newly opened flowers that have not received visitation by animals

(Brysch-Herzberg 2004b, Vannette and Fukami 2017, von Arx et al. 2019, Morris et al.

2020), but flower visitors introduce bacteria and fungi that successfully colonize floral

nectar (Lachance et al. 2001, Herrera et al. 2008). Second, the majority of bacteria and

fungi that survive and thrive in floral nectar are culturable (Morris et al. 2020)— shotgun

sequencing of nectar microbial communities reveal qualitatively similar taxonomic

composition to culture-based analyses. Third, bacteria and fungi in nectar are thought to

depend on phoresy via flower visitors (Brysch-Herzberg 2004b, Vannette and Fukami

2017, Morris et al. 2020). Fourth, plant species differ in flower morphologies associated

with variation in nectar accessibility to wind and animal pollinators.

In addition, the assembly processes shaping nectar microbial communities are thought

to depend on differential dispersal limitation. Laboratory experiments and field

observations suggest that inhibitory priority effects (interactions in which species arrival

order determines their outcome) influence community structure in floral nectar (Tucker

and Fukami 2014, Toju et al. 2018) via differential dispersal of species to flowers

(Mittelbach et al. 2016). However, positive interactions among nectar-inhabiting taxa

have been suggested (Alvarez-Pérez and Herrera 2013), so the relative influence of

dispersal and species interactions (including competition) on nectar microbe

metacommunities are not clear. Elucidating patterns of bacteria and fungi dispersal

limitation and co-occurrence in nectar would shed light on the mechanisms underlying

their community assembly, inform the competitive environments experienced by

bacteria and fungi in nectar, and have implications for microbial effects on interactions

between plants and floral visitors.

Here, we test the hypothesis that nectar-inhabiting bacteria and fungi differ in dispersal

and occupancy among individual flowers in two coflowering communities. We assess

realized dispersal—which integrates the components of emigration (leaving a habitat),

survival during transport, and establishment in a new habitat (flower)—which ultimately

determines community membership (Baguette et al. 2012). First, we examined microbial

dispersal ability empirically and second we assessed bacterial and fungal occupancy

(incidence) and abundance in individual nectar samples of more than 1800 flowers,

spanning 43 species of plants at two sites to examine 1) do bacteria or fungi differ in

dispersal ability by a common flower-visiting insect; 2) are patterns of bacterial and

fungal incidence or abundance in nectar similar across a plant community; 3) does

microbial presence or abundance differ among plant species or with floral accessibility

(flower morphology); 4) does season, year or site predict patterns of bacterial or fungal

incidence and abundance?

Materials and methods

Insect-based microbial dispersal assay

To empirically test whether nectar microbes differ in their dispersal ability, we developed

an assay of microbial dispersal resulting from the feeding activity of western flower

thrips (*Frankliniella occidentalis*). The assay consisted of 5 sterilized adult female thrips

freely foraging within a 96-well plate in which 1/3 of wells contained a microbial

suspension (200uL 10,000 cells/uL) in sweetened tryptic soy broth (TSB, adding 15%

sucrose and 15% fructose) and the remaining 2/3 of wells were filled with sterile TSB

(200uL). Thrips were sourced from a colony held by Diane Ullman (see Supplementary

Figure, Methods S1 for assay methods details). Microbial isolates from field sampling in

this study (see below and Supplementary Table S1), and other nectar-associated

microbe collections were used (6 bacteria, 5 fungi). After thrips foraged for 24 hours at

30°C under 16L:8D light, thrips were killed by adding 320uL of ethyl acetate to the plate

bottom and the media was incubated for 5 additional days. Control replicates with thrips

and no added microbes were included in all trials to ensure adequate sterilization and

trial consistency. Following incubation, we assessed microbial occupancy of initially

sterile wells by calculating the deviation of optical density (OD 600nm) from a blank

control plate (no thrips, no microbes) with an occupancy threshold equal to the mean

OD of control wells +6 standard deviations.

Coflowering community sampling for bacteria and fungi

To assess patterns of microbial incidence and abundance, we sampled standing crop

floral nectar during 2016 and 2017 at two sites in northern California: Stebbins Cold

Canyon Reserve (38.49806°, -122.09931° 140m, hereafter Stebbins) in Winters, CA

and at flowering plots maintained at the Laidlaw Honey Bee Facility (38.53653°, -

121.78864°, 19m, hereafter Bee Biology) in Davis, CA, which hosts an active apiary.

The sites are approximately 30 kilometers apart, and differ in pollinator species

composition and anthropogenic influence, but share a subset of plant species.

Between late February and early July, plant communities were sampled every two to

four weeks. We collected approximately 10 flowers from abundant plant species. In

some cases, collections were limited by floral availability and reserve collection

restrictions to protect plant populations. When possible, flowers were sampled from

multiple individual plants and sub-populations or plots (Supplementary Table S2). Care

was taken to sample flowers that had been open more than one day when possible, to

allow the opportunity for floral visitation and microbial immigration to flowers. Individual

inflorescences were collected, placed upright in humidified boxes and kept cool until

nectar extraction and plating, no more than 5 hours later. In the lab, flowers were

destructively sampled. Nectar was collected using 10 µl microcapillary tubes, and its

volume was quantified. Nectar was diluted in 30 µl of sterile water (D0), then diluted 10

and 100 fold (D1 and D2 respectively) in sterile phosphate-buffered saline (Dulbecco's,

pH 7.1-7.5). To assess fungal and bacterial abundance, 50 µl of the 10 fold dilution

(containing 5 µl of D0) and 50 µl of the 100 fold dilution (containing 0.5 µl of D0) were

plated on yeast media agar (YMA) containing the antibacterial chloramphenicol and

Reasoner's agar containing the antifungal cycloheximide (R2A Oxoid formula with 16%

sucrose), respectively. All samples were plated the day of collection. For convenience,

we refer to the total number of colonies on YMA as "fungi" and colonies on R2A as

"bacteria" throughout the manuscript although some colonies on each media type may

be comprised by microbes resistant to the antimicrobial compounds used here (e.g.

bacteria resistant to chloramphenicol (Dhami et al. 2018)). Based on dilution curves, we

were able to detect CFUs on plates at approximately 10^1 live cells in the original nectar

sample for YMA and 10^2 cells for R2A (Supplementary methods S2 and Figure S2).

Negative controls were plated for each sampling bout to detect potential

contamination and samples were discarded if contamination was detected (detected for

1 collection date; these samples were removed from the analysis). Agar plates were

incubated at 28°C and colony-forming units (CFUs) were counted after 48-72 hours.

The total number of CFUs and CFU density for each nectar sample was calculated

based on dilutions and original sample volume. Over the course of the study, 1,825

nectar samples were collected and plated on two media types. In 2016, colonies were

picked haphazardly from plates collected over the entire season including all sites and

plant species and frozen in glycerol.

Nectar accessibility: flower corolla length

Microbial dispersal to nectar is likely affected by the location and accessibility of floral

nectar within the flower. Specifically, nectar that is not enclosed by flower tissue may be

more easily accessed via wind dispersal and may also be accessible to a greater

diversity of insect visitors. On the other hand, nectar protected by flower tissues

comprising the perianth (non-reproductive structures of the flower) may be less

accessible via wind dispersal and contacted only when flowers are visited by long-

tongued birds or insects (Kingston and Mc Quillan 2000, Lara and Ornelas 2001). We

examined if bacterial or fungal incidence or abundance depended on nectar location

within the flower (flower corolla length). Nectar within flowers of each species were

classified as "exposed" (no corolla/exposed nectary), or contained within "short" (1-5

mm), "mid" (5-15 mm), or "long" (15+ mm) perianth, based on corolla tube length

(Supplementary table S2).

Microbial identification: culture-based and culture-independent analyses

A subset of microbial strains from glycerol stocks were identified using MALDI-TOF and
spectra were compared to Bruker Bacteria and Eukaryote libraries and a custom in-
house database curated from previously identified microbial isolates from nectar
(Supplementary methods S3). In addition, we used a culture-independent sequencing
approach to characterize diversity in full-length 16S and ITS sequences from 25 pooled
nectar samples (239 flowers in each sample), representing multiple sampling dates at
each site from 2016. Pooled nectar samples were extracted using the Nucleospin
Microbial DNA kit (Macherey-Nagel, Bethlehem, PA, USA) and submitted for full-length
PacBio16S and ITS sequencing performed at Dalhousie IMR. Recovered sequences
were processed using dada2 pipeline for full-length rRNA genes (Callahan et al. 2016,
Callahan et al. 2019) for recovery of actual sequence variants (ASVs). Briefly, primer
sequences were removed, and resulting sequences were quality filtered, error-corrected
and denoised followed by taxonomy assignment using SILVA v. 138 training set (Quast
et al. 2012) for bacteria and UNITE 4/2/2020 release for fungi (Kõljalg et al. 2005)
followed by chimera detection and removal (See Dryad https://doi.org/10.25338/B8403V
for bioinformatics scripts). ASVs annotated as chloroplast or plant, and those that were
also obtained from extraction blanks were removed.
219

Statistical analysis
To examine if microbes differed in dispersal ability in our experimental setup, the
proportion of wells colonized by a microbe within a plate (calculated using OD as
described above; plates as replicates) was analyzed using a binomial GLMM (package
lme4) to compare bacterial and fungal dispersal plates with strain as a random effect. A
t-test was also used to compare bacteria and fungi by the mean proportion of wells
colonized by each strain across 8 replicate plates.
227

228 To examine the relationship between bacterial and fungal incidence and abundance in
229 individual nectar samples, we used Pearson correlations. In addition, we report directly
230 calculated conditional probabilities and a χ^2 test to test for non-independence of
231 bacterial and fungal incidence amongst flowers.
232

To compare plant species differed in bacterial or fungal presence or abundance, we

used logistic regression and linear regression with plant species as a predictor. To

compare if nectar accessibility quantified using corolla length category was associated

with bacterial or fungal presence or abundance, we used logistic regression and linear

regression with nectary location (exposed, short corolla, mid corolla or long corolla) as a

predictor.

To determine if bacteria and fungi differ in incidence in floral nectar with Julian date,

between sites, or between years, we used a logistic regression implemented using

'glm', using bacteria or fungal presence as a response and site, year, and plant species,

and their two-way interactions, as predictors. We compared among: models containing

all interactions, models with non-significant interactions removed, and models with no

interactions using AIC, and from the best-fit model, significance of each term was

assessed using likelihood ratio tests. To determine if bacteria or fungi differ in

abundance in floral nectar across years or sites, or with Julian date, we used a linear

regression implemented using 'lm', with $\log_{10}(CFUs+1)$ as a response and site, Julian

date, and year as predictors. Model selection was performed on bacteria and fungi

separately using AIC as described above, and significance was assessed using

likelihood ratio tests.

We assessed the frequency with which microbial genera were detected using MALDI-

TOF among flower morphologies, or across the season (early, mid, or late, see

supplement for details) using a χ^2 test for contingency tables. Microbial composition

from PacBio sequencing is presented to compare taxonomic composition with MALDI-

TOF data but due to limited numbers of samples successfully sequenced, no formal

analysis was performed. All analyses were conducted using RStudio and R v. 3.6.3

(Johnson et al. 2009).

Results

Insect-based dispersal assay

Fungi were less able to disperse among wells than bacteria in the thrips dispersal assay

(Figure 1). Using strain-level averages to compare dispersal abilities between

kingdoms, bacteria colonized 31% more wells than did fungi over 24 hours of thrips

activity (t-test, strains as replicates, t = 4.31, p=0.002). Results from the GLMM confirm

this difference between fungi and bacteria average dispersal ability (z-value =-4.66,

p<0.001). Control treatments had detectable, but low levels of contamination (higher

than two fungal strains) despite exhaustive measures to sterilize thrips.

Patterns of bacterial and fungal incidence and co-occurrence in floral nectar

Floral nectar samples from the field contained colonies on R2A media (hereafter

'bacteria') in 49% of samples, whereas colonies on YMA (hereafter, 'fungi') were

detected in only 20% of samples (microbe LRT=21.07, p<0.001, Figure 2). Fungi and

bacteria co-occur in flowers nearly 1.5 times as frequently as would be expected by

chance given their individual incidence across the landscape (14% of flowers contain

both, compared to 9% of flowers estimated joint probability if independent, χ^2=94.37,

p<0.001). Along with the difference between bacterial (49%) and fungal (20%) incidence

across the landscape, this elevated frequency of co-occurrence results in a discrepancy

between the likelihoods that fungi or bacteria find themselves co-occupying a flower

(conditional probabilities of co-occupancy for each microbe). Fungi (most often yeasts)

are most often found in flowers alongside bacteria (P(bacteria present | fungi present) =

69%). On the other hand, bacteria only occasionally co-occupy a flower with fungi

(P(fungi present | bacteria present) = 29%).

Moreover, fungi and bacteria demonstrate a positive correlation in CFU abundance

across flowers (Pearson correlation, r = 0.27, p<0.001), which persists even when

investigating only flowers that contain both bacteria and fungi (Pearson correlation,

r=0.24, p<0.001). Within plant species, fungi and bacterial incidence and abundance are

most often positively correlated, but only significantly in four species (Supplementary

Figure S3).

Nectar location associated with variation in microbial incidence and abundance

Plant species differed in microbial incidence (bacteria LRT=306, p<0.001; fungi

LRT=271.09, p<0.001) and abundance (bacterial CFUs $F_{41,1816}$=9.3, p<0.001; fungal

CFUs $F_{41,1816}$=7.3, p<0.001) in floral nectar (Figure 3) ranging from an average of 20%

to 100% of sampled flowers containing bacteria. Nectar location within a flower was

associated with some of this variation (Figure 4). Both bacteria and fungi were more

frequently detected in nectar of plant species with an exposed nectary than those with

short, mid or long corollas (Figure 4; bacteria LRT=8.1, p=0.04; fungi LRT=52.9,

p<0.001). Microbial abundance also varied with flower traits, but bacteria and fungi

differed in their responses. Bacteria were more abundant in flowers with exposed nectar

($F_{3,1813}$=4.65, p=0.003) whereas fungal CFUs were most abundant when nectar is

contained within a long corolla (Figure 4; $F_{3,1810}$ =29.1, p<0.001) compared to other

flower morphologies.

Sources of variation in bacterial and fungal incidence and abundance

Microbial incidence differed between geographic sites and years, and changed through

the season (Julian date) (Supplementary Tables S3, Figure S4). Bacteria and fungi

differed in which site each was more detectable and abundant, with bacteria more

frequently detected and abundant at the Bee Biology site (Table S3) and fungi more

frequently detected and abundant at the natural reserve site (Table S3). The probability

of detection of both bacteria and fungi changed across the season—most often

increasing with Julian date—and among years and sites relatively similarly (Figure S4),

whereas patterns of fungal and bacterial abundance tended to differ in response to

seasons and years.

Microbial identification and genus-specific patterns

Bacteria from the genus *Acinetobacter* were the most common bacterial genera

detected based on MALDI and PacBio sequencing, (Supplementary Table S4, Figure

S5). Yeasts from the genera *Metschnikowia* and *Candida* were the most commonly

identified fungi (Supplementary Table S4, Supplementary Figure S5). Filamentous fungi

could not be identified using MALDI, but *Penicillium*, *Cladosporium*, and *Epicoccum*

were detected using PacBio sequencing of the ITS region.

Microbial genera differed in their patterns of incidence among flowers of different

morphologies. The bacterial genus *Acinetobacter* was significantly overrepresented in

flowers with short corollas (Supplementary Figure S6), whereas *Pseudomonas* and the

yeast *Metschnikowia* were significantly overrepresented in flowers with long corollas.

Seasonal patterns were also observed: *Lactobacillus* and *Pseudomonas* were

significantly overrepresented in the early season, whereas *Acinetobacter* and

Metschnikowia were significantly underrepresented in flowers during the early season

(Supplementary Figure S7).

Discussion

In our survey, bacteria were more commonly detected in floral nectar than were fungi,

and greater dispersal ability of bacteria in the experimental dispersal assay provides

support for the hypothesis that differences in dispersal ability shape bacterial and fungal

occupancy of coflowering communities sampled in northern California. Our use of

culture-based detection is conservative in detecting bacteria (Supplementary methods

S2 and Supplementary Figure S2), and the taxa detected in our sequencing efforts

matched well to those detected in culture analyses, suggesting that our sampling

represented well the majority of microbial community members. Our results reveal that

bacteria and fungi differ in dispersal ability between flowers but frequently coexist

across this and many other metacommunities. Fungal dispersal limitation may be

compensated for by previously characterized differences in life histories including

attraction of insect vectors by fungi or competitive exclusion of bacteria through priority

effects.

Nectar-inhabiting bacteria and fungi are both likely to rely on frequent dispersal

(Madden et al. 2018, Vannette 2020) because individual flowers typically persist a short

time (hours to days) (Primack 1985). Previous studies and our own observations

suggest multiple adaptations in both bacteria and yeasts for enhanced dispersal.

Bacteria from the dominant genera found in nectar (e.g. *Acinetobacter*, *Rosenbergiella*)

form sticky biofilms (Irie and Parsek 2008, Jung and Park 2015, Álvarez-Pérez et al.

2019), which could enhance adhesion to insect vectors. In addition, the yeasts common

to nectar exhibit cell morphology that may improve adhesion to insect or bird

mouthparts (e.g. 'airplane' cells in the yeast *Metschnikowia gruessi* (Brysch-Herzberg

2004b)). Bacteria and fungi, including yeasts, could produce stress-tolerant spores that

enhance desiccation resistance (Francisco et al. 2019) and survival during transport

between flowers. Microbial volatile compounds (Vannette et al. 2013, Rering et al. 2018)

also affect vector attraction to flowers and visit duration (reviewed in Crowley-Gall et al.

2020). The greater dispersal ability of bacteria observed here could be due to enhanced

vector attraction, ease of attachment to insect vectors, persistence in association with,

survival on, or localization within hosts (Perilla-Henao and Casteel 2016), or more

efficient colonization success of nectar, but further study would be required to

disentangle the specific mechanisms that underlie bacterial dispersal ability.

Bacterial numerical dominance and superior dispersal ability could predict bacterial

exclusion of fungi in nectar over ecological time via mass effects (Leibold et al. 2004),

so it may be notable that fungi persist in the nectar environment. Coexistence between

bacteria and fungi could be explained by a few factors. First, different modes of

dispersal could favor different microbial species. For example, some yeasts may

enhance attraction, specialize in attachment, or engage in persistent associations with

particular flower visitors, as has been documented for bumble bees and *Metschnikowia*

yeasts (Brysch-Herzberg 2004, Herrera et al. 2013, Jacquemyn et al. 2020). When

those flower visitor species are abundant, yeast dispersal and abundance in the floral

nectar metacommunity is predicted to increase. Similarly, spore-forming fungi may rely

on wind dispersal, although the incidence and abundance of filamentous fungi in floral

nectar was very low in our survey. Second, plant species may differ in suitability for

colonization by yeasts compared to bacteria (Figures 3 & 4) or differ in flower conditions

that affect yeast competitive ability. Floral nectar in some species contains antimicrobial

defenses (González-Teuber and Heil 2009) including antifungal and antibacterial

enzymes (Thornburg et al. 2003, Carter and Thornburg 2004, Roy et al. 2017, Schmitt

et al. 2018), some of which could differentially reduce bacterial growth compared to

yeast growth. Here, flowers with long corollas which host abundant yeast populations

not reflected in bacterial populations. However, whether visitation by long-tongued

pollinator taxa (Brysch-Herzberg 2004a, Pozo et al. 2012), or floral traits including

reduced desiccation probability and reduced UV exposure (Plowright 1987) could

enhance yeast colonization or growth in flowers with long corollas is unclear. Third,

interference competition by fungi, including production of antimicrobial compounds,

nutrient scavenging ability (Dhami et al. 2016), or environmental modification (Tucker

and Fukami 2014, Vannette and Fukami 2014) could lead to suppression of bacterial

populations in longer-lived flowers (but see discussion below).

Our data also reveal genus-specific patterns of plant colonization and seasonal change

for a few common nectar-inhabiting microbes that may shed light on their dispersal

ecology. Yeasts from the genus *Metschnikowia* were most frequently isolated from

flowers with longer corollas (Supplementary Figure S6), consistent with previous reports

of reliance on large-bodied bees and hummingbirds for among-flower dispersal (Herrera

et al. 2010, Vannette and Fukami 2017, Morris et al. 2020). In contrast, bacteria from

the genus *Acinetobacter* were more frequently isolated from flowers with shorter

corollas, indicating either different dispersal vectors or the ability to successfully

colonize flowers with different morphologies compared to *Metschnikowia*. For both of

these nectar-inhabiting genera, incidence increased over the season. We note that

many relevant ecological factors change in tandem seasonally: temperature increases,

the number of flower-visiting insects increases and change in species composition, and

floral density also changes across the flowering period sampled here. Previous work

has shown that the flower visitor community is associated with microbial community

composition and network properties in a coflowering community (Zemenick et al. 2021)

but whether turnover in flower visitor species or other seasonal changes are the most

important drivers of microbial composition over time is unclear.

Distinct patterns of bacterial and fungal presence and abundance in floral nectar

documented here have a few specific implications for the ecology and evolution of the

floral microbiome. For more prevalent nectar bacteria, inter-kingdom competition may

be less important in the evolution of bacterial traits and life-history than for fungi, which

are frequently exposed to competition with bacteria (Figure 2). Some models suggest

that conditions of frequent yeast-bacterial interactions favor the evolution of antibacterial

production by yeasts (Zhou et al. 2018). Nectar yeast have been hypothesized to

produce metabolites that reduce bacterial growth (Álvarez-Pérez et al. 2019) and nectar

yeast genomes contain scaffolds annotated as containing genes with potential

antimicrobial function, including polyketide synthase-like and non-ribosomal peptide

synthetase cluster-like (Nordberg et al. 2014), but experimental work is lacking. In

contrast, experimental and genomic evidence suggests that *Metschnikowia reukaufii*

benefits from rapid nutrient assimilation (Dhami et al. 2016) and population growth

(Pozo et al. 2012), suggesting maximizing propagule abundance is an important

strategy for nectar microbial populations (Hibbing et al. 2010). Moreover, our data do

not reveal strong negative correlations between fungi and bacterial abundance in

nectar, either among or within species (Supplementary Figure S3), suggesting that

interference competition may not be strong in our focal populations. Instead, we noted

positive correlations between fungal and bacterial abundance at the flower level, which

could indicate shared dispersal vectors, similar habitat requirements for culturable

nectar microbes, or the possibility of facilitation which could be promoted by bacterial

enhancement of nutrients in nectar from pollen or other plant sources (Christensen et al.

2021).

Taken together, the data presented here demonstrate that common nectar-inhabiting

fungi are more dispersal limited than are bacteria and less frequently detected among

flowers. Previous work has shown that dispersal can be important in structuring

bacterial community assembly (Albright and Martiny 2018), and generate the possibility

of historically contingent competitive outcomes in microbial communities (Fukami 2015,

Svoboda et al. 2018). By demonstrating clear differences in dispersal ability, our results

extend this to interactions between bacteria and fungi. We suggest that further study of

the consequences of variation in dispersal differences between bacterial and fungal

taxa may inform the types and temporal dynamics of interactions between them, and

consequences for host-microbe and multitrophic interactions in flowers.

Acknowledgements

We are grateful to the University of California Natural Reserve System, the Laidlaw Honey Bee Research Facility, Jeffrey Clarey and Neal Williams for site access, Diane Ullman for the thrips colony, Amin Montazer for help with lab work, Will Jewell and Barbara Byrnes for training and technical support with MALDI-TOF, and to the Vannette lab group for providing feedback on initial drafts of this manuscript. RLV was supported by UC Davis, the Hellman Fund, the United States Department of Agriculture Hatch funds multistate NE1501 and the National Science Foundation DEB #1846266.

Data and code accessibility statement: Data and code are available through Dryad DOI: https://doi.org/10.25338/B8403V

Conflict of Interest statement: No conflict of interest to report

References

Albright, M. B. N., and J. B. H. Martiny. 2018. Dispersal alters bacterial diversity and composition in a natural community. The ISME journal **12**:296-299.

Alexander, H. M., and J. Antonovics. 1988. Disease spread and population dynamics of anther-smut infection of Silene alba caused by the fungus Ustilago violacea. The Journal of Ecology:91-104.

Alvarez-Pérez, S., and C. M. Herrera. 2013. Composition, richness and nonrandom assembly of culturable bacterial-microfungal communities in floral nectar of Mediterranean plants. FEMS Microbiol Ecol **83**.

Álvarez-Pérez, S., C. M. Herrera, and C. de Vega. 2012. Zooming-in on floral nectar: a first exploration of nectar-associated bacteria in wild plant communities. Fems Microbiology Ecology **80**:591-602.

Álvarez-Pérez, S., B. Lievens, and T. Fukami. 2019. Yeast–Bacterium Interactions: The Next Frontier in Nectar Research. Trends in plant science **24**:393-401.

Baguette, M., T. G. Benton, and J. M. Bullock. 2012. Dispersal ecology and evolution. Oxford University Press.

Barberán, A., J. Ladau, J. W. Leff, K. S. Pollard, H. L. Menninger, R. R. Dunn, and N. Fierer. 2015. Continental-scale distributions of dust-associated bacteria and fungi. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences **112**:5756-5761.

Belisle, M., K. G. Peay, and T. Fukami. 2012. Flowers as islands: spatial distribution of nectar-inhabiting microfungi among plants of *Mimulus aurantiacus*, a hummingbird-pollinated shrub. Microbial Ecology **63**:711-718.

Brysch-Herzberg, M. 2004a. Ecology and taxonomy of yeasts associated with the plant-bumblebee mutualism in central Europe. FEMS Microbiol Ecol **50**.

Brysch-Herzberg, M. 2004b. Ecology of yeasts in plant-bumblebee mutualism in Central Europe. Fems Microbiology Ecology **50**:87-100.

Callahan, B. J., P. J. McMurdie, M. J. Rosen, A. W. Han, A. J. A. Johnson, and S. P. Holmes. 2016. DADA2: high-resolution sample inference from Illumina amplicon data. Nature methods **13**:581.

Callahan, B. J., J. Wong, C. Heiner, S. Oh, C. M. Theriot, A. S. Gulati, S. K. McGill, and M. K. Dougherty. 2019. High-throughput amplicon sequencing of the full-length 16S rRNA gene with single-nucleotide resolution. Nucleic acids research **47**:e103-e103.

Carter, C., and R. W. Thornburg. 2004. Is the nectar redox cycle a floral defense against microbial attack? Trends in Plant Science **9**:320-324.

Chappell, C. R., and T. Fukami. 2018. Nectar yeasts: a natural microcosm for ecology. Yeast **35**:417-423.

Christensen, S. M., I. Munkres, and R. L. Vannette. 2021. Nectar bacteria stimulate pollen germination and bursting to enhance their fitness. bioRxiv:2021.2001.2007.425766.

Crowley-Gall, A., C. R. Rering, A. B. Rudolph, R. L. Vannette, and J. J. Beck. 2020. Volatile microbial semiochemicals and insect perception at flowers. Current Opinion in Insect Science.

Dhami, M. K., T. Hartwig, and T. Fukami. 2016a. Genetic basis of priority effects: insights from nectar yeast. Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences **283**:20161455.

Dhami, M. K., T. Hartwig, A. D. Letten, M. Banf, and T. Fukami. 2018. Genomic diversity of a
nectar yeast clusters into metabolically, but not geographically, distinct lineages.
Molecular Ecology **27**:2067-2076.
Francisco, C. S., X. Ma, M. M. Zwyssig, B. A. McDonald, and J. Palma-Guerrero. 2019.
Morphological changes in response to environmental stresses in the fungal plant
pathogen Zymoseptoria tritici. Scientific reports **9**:9642.
Fridman, S., I. Izhaki, Y. Gerchman, and M. Halpern. 2012. Bacterial communities in floral
nectar. Environmental Microbiology Reports **4**:97-104.
Fukami, T. 2015. Historical contingency in community assembly: integrating niches, species
pools, and priority effects. Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics **46**.
González-Teuber, M., and M. Heil. 2009. Nectar chemistry is tailored for both attraction of
mutualists and protection from exploiters. Plant signaling & behavior **4**:809-813.
Herrera, C. M., A. Canto, M. I. Pozo, and P. Bazaga. 2010. Inhospitable sweetness: nectar
filtering of pollinator-borne inocula leads to impoverished, phylogenetically clustered
yeast communities. Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences **277**:747-754.
Herrera, C. M., C. de Vega, A. Canto, and M. I. Pozo. 2009. Yeasts in floral nectar: a quantitative
survey. Annals of Botany **103**:1415-1423.
Herrera, C. M., I. M. Garcia, and R. Perez. 2008. Invisible floral larcenies: Microbial communities
degrade floral nectar of bumble bee-pollinated plants. Ecology **89**:2369-2376.
Herrera, C. M., M. I. Pozo, and M. Medrano. 2013. Yeasts in nectar of an early-blooming herb:
sought by bumble bees, detrimental to plant fecundity. Ecology **94**:273-279.
Hibbing, M. E., C. Fuqua, M. R. Parsek, and S. B. Peterson. 2010. Bacterial competition: surviving
and thriving in the microbial jungle. Nature reviews. Microbiology **8**:15-25.
Irie, Y., and M. R. Parsek. 2008. Quorum Sensing and Microbial Biofilms. Pages 67-84 *in* T.
Romeo, editor. Bacterial Biofilms. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg.
Jacquemyn, H., M. I. Pozo, S. Álvarez-Pérez, B. Lievens, and T. Fukami. 2020. Yeast-nectar
interactions: metacommunities and effects on pollinators. Current Opinion in Insect
Science.
Johnson, R. M., J. D. Evans, G. E. Robinson, and M. R. Berenbaum. 2009. Changes in transcript
abundance relating to colony collapse disorder in honey bees (*Apis mellifera*).
Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences **106**:14790-14795.
Jung, J., and W. Park. 2015. Acinetobacter species as model microorganisms in environmental
microbiology: current state and perspectives. Applied Microbiology and Biotechnology
99:2533-2548.
Kingston, A. B., and P. B. Mc Quillan. 2000. Are pollination syndromes useful predictors of floral
visitors in Tasmania? Austral Ecology **25**:600-609.
Kõljalg, U., K. H. Larsson, K. Abarenkov, R. H. Nilsson, I. J. Alexander, U. Eberhardt, S. Erland, K.
Høiland, R. Kjøller, and E. Larsson. 2005. UNITE: a database providing web-based
methods for the molecular identification of ectomycorrhizal fungi. New Phytologist
166:1063-1068.
Koskella, B., L. J. Hall, and C. J. E. Metcalf. 2017. The microbiome beyond the horizon of
ecological and evolutionary theory. Nature Ecology & Evolution **1**:1606-1615.
Kraemer, S., and P. Boynton. 2016. Evidence for microbial local adaptation in nature. Molecular
Ecology.

Lachance, M. A., W. T. Starmer, C. A. Rosa, J. M. Bowles, J. S. F. Barker, and D. H. Janzen. 2001.
Biogeography of the yeasts of ephemeral flowers and their insects. Fems Yeast Research
1:1-8.
Lara, C., and J. Ornelas. 2001. Preferential nectar robbing of flowers with long corollas:
experimental studies of two hummingbird species visiting three plant species. Oecologia
128:263-273.
Leibold, M. A., M. Holyoak, N. Mouquet, P. Amarasekare, J. Chase, M. Hoopes, R. Holt, J. Shurin,
R. Law, and D. Tilman. 2004. The metacommunity concept: a framework for multi-scale
community ecology. Ecology Letters **7**:601-613.
Lenaerts, M., T. Goelen, C. Paulussen, B. Herrera-Malaver, J. Steensels, W. Van den Ende, K. J.
Verstrepen, F. Wäckers, H. Jacquemyn, and B. Lievens. 2017. Nectar bacteria affect life
history of a generalist aphid parasitoid by altering nectar chemistry. Functional Ecology.
Lindow, S. E., and G. L. Andersen. 1996. Influence of immigration on epiphytic bacterial
populations on navel orange leaves. Applied and environmental microbiology **62**:2978-
2987.
Madden, A. A., M. J. Epps, T. Fukami, R. E. Irwin, J. Sheppard, D. M. Sorger, and R. R. Dunn.
2018. The ecology of insect–yeast relationships and its relevance to human industry.
Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences **285**:20172733.
Mittelbach, M., A. M. Yurkov, R. Stoll, and D. Begerow. 2016. Inoculation order of nectar-borne
yeasts opens a door for transient species and changes nectar rewarded to pollinators.
Fungal Ecology.
Morris, M., N. Frixione, A. Burkert, E. Dinsdale, and R. L. Vannette. 2020. Microbial abundance,
composition, and function in nectar are shaped by flower visitor identity. FEMS
Microbiol Ecol **96**:3.
Mouquet, N., and M. Loreau. 2003. Community patterns in source-sink metacommunities. The
american naturalist **162**:544-557.
Ngugi, H. K., and H. Scherm. 2006. Biology of flower-infecting fungi. Annu. Rev. Phytopathol.
44:261-282.
Nordberg, H., M. Cantor, S. Dusheyko, S. Hua, A. Poliakov, I. Shabalov, T. Smirnova, I. V.
Grigoriev, and I. Dubchak. 2014. The genome portal of the Department of Energy Joint
Genome Institute: 2014 updates. Nucleic acids research **42**:D26-D31.
Peay, K. G., M. G. Schubert, N. H. Nguyen, and T. D. Bruns. 2012. Measuring ectomycorrhizal
fungal dispersal: macroecological patterns driven by microscopic propagules. Molecular
Ecology **21**:4122-4136.
Perilla-Henao, L. M., and C. L. Casteel. 2016. Vector-Borne Bacterial Plant Pathogens:
Interactions with Hemipteran Insects and Plants. Frontiers in Plant Science **7**.
Plowright, R. 1987. Corolla depth and nectar concentration: an experimental study. Canadian
Journal of Botany **65**:1011-1013.
Pozo, M. I., M.-A. Lachance, and C. M. Herrera. 2012. Nectar yeasts of two southern Spanish
plants: the roles of immigration and physiological traits in community assembly. Fems
Microbiology Ecology **80**:281-293.
Primack, R. B. 1985. Longevity of individual flowers. Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics
16:15-37.

Quast, C., E. Pruesse, P. Yilmaz, J. Gerken, T. Schweer, P. Yarza, J. Peplies, and F. O. Glöckner.
2012. The SILVA ribosomal RNA gene database project: improved data processing and
web-based tools. Nucleic acids research **41**:D590-D596.
Rering, C. C., J. J. Beck, G. W. Hall, M. M. McCartney, and R. L. Vannette. 2018. Nectar-inhabiting
microorganisms influence nectar volatile composition and attractiveness to a generalist
pollinator. New Phytologist.
Roy, R., A. J. Schmitt, J. B. Thomas, and C. J. Carter. 2017. Nectar biology: from molecules to
ecosystems. Plant Science **262**:148-164.
Schaeffer, R., and R. E. Irwin. 2014. Yeasts in nectar enhance male fitness in a montane
perennial herb. Ecology **95**:1792-1798.
Schmitt, A. J., A. E. Sathoff, C. Holl, B. Bauer, D. A. Samac, and C. J. Carter. 2018. The major
nectar protein of Brassica rapa is a non-specific lipid transfer protein, BrLTP2.1, with
strong antifungal activity. Journal of Experimental Botany **69**:5587-5597.
Sobhy, I. S., D. Baets, T. Goelen, B. Herrera-Malaver, L. Bosmans, W. Van den Ende, K. J.
Verstrepen, F. Wäckers, H. Jacquemyn, and B. Lievens. 2018. Sweet Scents: Nectar
Specialist Yeasts Enhance Nectar Attraction of a Generalist Aphid Parasitoid Without
Affecting Survival. Frontiers in Plant Science **9**.
Svoboda, P., E. S. Lindström, O. Ahmed Osman, and S. Langenheder. 2018. Dispersal timing
determines the importance of priority effects in bacterial communities. The ISME
journal **12**:644-646.
Thornburg, R. W., C. Carter, A. Powell, R. Mittler, L. Rizhsky, and H. T. Horner. 2003. A major
function of the tobacco floral nectary is defense against microbial attack. Plant
Systematics and Evolution **238**:211-218.
Toju, H., R. L. Vannette, M. P. L. Gauthier, M. K. Dhami, and T. Fukami. 2018. Priority effects can
persist across floral generations in nectar microbial metacommunities. Oikos **127**:345-
352.
Tsuji, K., and T. Fukami. 2018. Community-wide consequences of sexual dimorphism: evidence
from nectar microbes in dioecious plants. Ecology **99**:2476-2484.
Tucker, C. M., and T. Fukami. 2014. Environmental variability counteracts priority effects to
facilitate species coexistence: evidence from nectar microbes. Proceedings of the Royal
Society of London B: Biological Sciences **281**:20132637.
Vannette, R. L. 2020. The Floral Microbiome: Plant, Pollinator, and Microbial Perspectives.
Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics **51**:363-386.
Vannette, R. L., and T. Fukami. 2014. Historical contingency in species interactions: towards
niche-based predictions. Ecology letters **17**:115-124.
Vannette, R. L., and T. Fukami. 2017. Dispersal enhances beta diversity in nectar microbes.
Ecology Letters.
Vannette, R. L., M.-P. L. Gauthier, and T. Fukami. 2013. Nectar bacteria, but not yeast, weaken a
plant-pollinator mutualism. Proceedings of the Royal Society B-Biological Sciences **280**.
von Arx, M., A. Moore, G. Davidowitz, and A. E. Arnold. 2019. Diversity and distribution of
microbial communities in floral nectar of two night-blooming plants of the Sonoran
Desert. Plos One **14**.

Zhou, N., M. Katz, W. Knecht, C. Compagno, and J. Piškur. 2018. Genome dynamics and
evolution in yeasts: A long-term yeast-bacteria competition experiment. Plos One
13:e0194911.

Figure 1 – Western flower thrips (*Frankliniella occidentalis*) disperse bacteria between artificial nectar habitats more readily than fungi. Each bar shows the relative success of a different isolate of bacteria or fungus in colonizing wells on a 96-well plate through the activity of sterilized thrips (N=8-12 plates per isolate). Microbes with superscript 'Fo' were isolated from *Frankliniella occidentalis*. The control bar represents trials in which all wells began sterile and only thrips were added, representing contamination levels from thrips only. Bar heights report mean values (+/- 1 S.E.) for the proportion of available well's colonized after 24 hours of thrips activity and a subsequent 6 days of culturing in an incubator.

Figure 2 – Bacterial and fungal incidence in nectar in the two flowering plant communities sampled. The figure shows the relative incidence of bacteria and fungi in individual nectar according to shaded areas and their proportions of flower occupancy. Bacteria occur in more flowers than fungi across the landscape. The two kingdoms co-occur within nectar more often than would be predicted by chance. Fungi rarely occur in the absence of bacteria, but bacteria frequently occur in the absence of fungi.

Figure 3 –Plant species vary in A) the proportion of total nectar samples containing colonies or B) the average calculated abundance of CFUs in microbial-colonized nectar on R2A media with antifungal compound ('bacteria', blue) or colonies on YMA media with antibacterial ('fungi', orange), ordered by increasing incidence of bacteria in samples. N=6-211 per species; median=23 nectar samples/species.

Figure 4 – Microbial incidence and abundance in nectar varies location of the nectar (corolla length). Average microbial abundance in flowers was calculated using colony forming units counted on R2A (blue, bacteria) and YMA (fungi, orange) media and adjusted based on nectar volume. Microbial CFU abundance calculated using only those nectar samples containing detectable microbial growth. Note difference between y-axes between bacteria and fungi in microbial abundance.