Defensive mutualisms affect plant and ant island biogeography at a global scale

Drin Brown[1,2] and Megan E. Frederickson[1,3]

[1]Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, University of Toronto, 25 Willcocks Street,

Toronto, Ontario M5S 3B2, Canada

[2]Author for correspondence: Drin Brown, email: drin.brown@gmail.com

[3]Email: m.frederickson@utoronto.ca

Running title: Island biogeography of ant-plant mutualisms

Keywords: mutualism, island biogeography, macroecology, plant-animal interactions,

extrafloral nectaries, pollination, mycorrhizae, nitrogen-fixing symbionts

Article type: Research article

Number of words in abstract: 297

Number of words in main text: 5682

Number of references: 78

Number of figures and tables in main text: 4 figures and 3 tables

Authorship statement: DB and MEF designed the study, DB performed modeling work and

analyzed data with input from MEF, DB wrote the first draft of the manuscript, and both authors

jointly revised the manuscript for submission.

Data statement: This paper uses publicly available data for analyses. All data sources are cited

in the manuscript and code. All code is available on GitHub (https://github.com/drinnnird-

uoft/island-mainland-EFN) and Dryad (reviewer URL

Acknowledgements: We thank the Frederickson Lab for helpful feedback as this project

developed. We also thank all the natural historians who have documented ant and plant trait data

that culminated in the databases used in this study.

Funding: M.E.F. thanks the NSERC Discovery Grant program for financial support.

Novelty statement: Delavaux et al. (2024) claimed that mutualism filters plant diversity on

islands, thereby weakening the latitudinal diversity gradient on islands. We re-analyzed their

data, adding a new mutualism type: the defensive mutualism between plants with extrafloral

nectaries (EFNs) and the ants that protect them from herbivores. By analyzing the geographic

distributions of mutualistic plants and their ant partners on islands and mainlands, we found that

ant and plant species that interact mutualistically via EFNs are over-represented on oceanic

islands compared to other taxa. Thus, counter to Delavaux et al. (2024), this defensive ant-plant

mutualism enhances rather than filters species richness on islands. Furthermore, this mutualism

does not weaken the LDG on islands.

Abstract

Aim: Mutualism can shape biogeographic patterns at macroecological scales. Recently, Delavaux et al. (2024) found that plant mutualisms with mycorrhizae, nitrogen-fixing bacteria, and animal pollinators limit island colonization, weakening the latitudinal diversity gradient (LDG) on oceanic islands. Here, we revisit their analysis and examine whether ants and plants engaged in a common defensive mutualism mediated by extrafloral nectaries (EFN) are similarly under-represented on oceanic islands, and whether this defensive ant-plant mutualism also weakens the LDG on islands.

Location: Global.

Time period: Present-day species distributions and traits.

Major taxa studied: Vascular plants and ants.

Methods: We used global trait and occurrence databases to compare ant and plant species richness between oceanic islands and their likely source mainlands for taxa that do and do not interact mutualistically via EFNs. When analyzing the factors that determine whether a plant species occurs on oceanic islands, we also included the mutualism types studied by Delavaux et al. (2024), namely biotic pollination, mycorrhizal fungi, and nitrogen-fixing bacteria, and added plant habit, life history, and phylogeny as covariates.

Results: Both plants with EFNs and EFN-visiting ants are significantly over-represented on islands. The species richness of EFN-visiting ants and EFN-bearing plants also positively covary across islands. In ants, engaging in mutualisms mediated by EFNs significantly strengthens, rather than weakens, the LDG on islands, while for plants, EFNs have no effect or strengthen the LDG on islands, depending on data filtering. After accounting for plant habit, life history, and

phylogeny, only biotic pollination significantly limits plant colonization of islands, whereas

mycorrhizae and nitrogen-fixing bacteria now have positive or non-significant effects,

respectively, on island colonization.

Main conclusions: EFNs facilitate rather than limit plant and ant colonization on islands.

Mutualism does not ubiquitously limit island colonization, and some mutualism types strengthen

rather than dampen the LDG on islands.

Introduction

Reciprocally beneficial species interactions, or mutualisms, can shape biodiversity at

macroecological scales. Mutualism can enlarge a species' realized niche (Fowler et al., 2023) or

geographic range (Afkhami et al., 2014, Nathan et al., 2023) and may be especially likely to

facilitate range expansion if the interaction is generalized (Harrison et al., 2018), because local

species may cooperate with the immigrating species and encourage its establishment (Chomicki

et al., 2019). However, in specialized, obligate mutualisms, both partners may need to be present

to establish in a new location, potentially limiting colonization opportunities for mutualist

species (Simonsen et al., 2017, Delavaux et al., 2024, 2025). Here, we examined how defensive

ant-plant mutualisms affect species richness on oceanic islands, where mutualism has been

proposed to act as a strong filter on colonization (Delavaux et al., 2019, 2021, 2022, 2024).

Species richness on islands depends on the balance among colonization, speciation, and

extinction or emigration, with island size and isolation from mainland sources of colonists being

the primary determinants of species richness on islands (MacArthur and Wilson, 2001, Delavaux

et al., 2021). However, biotic interactions may also limit colonization on islands, particularly on

oceanic islands that were never part of a continent (Delavaux et al., 2024). Recently, Delavaux et

al. (2019, 2021, 2022, 2024) found that mutualists have a reduced likelihood of colonizing

oceanic islands, potentially because of a scarcity of compatible partners. Specifically, Delavaux

et al. (2019, 2021, 2022, 2024) found that plants that associate with mycorrhizal fungi, nitrogen-

fixing bacteria, and animal pollinators are more under-represented on islands than plants that

lack these mutualistic associations, with important consequences for island ecosystems and

biodiversity. For example, because biological nitrogen fixation is the primary means by which

nitrogen enters the biosphere from the atmosphere, if the symbiosis between plants and N-fixing

bacteria prevents these species from colonizing islands, island soils may not receive the same

inputs of fixed N as mainland soils (Delavaux et al., 2022). Furthermore, although species

richness generally increases from the poles to the equator, a pattern known as the latitudinal

diversity gradient (LDG, Hillebrand, 2004; Kinlock et al., 2018), Delavaux et al. (2024) found

that the mutualism filter on island species richness was strong enough to weaken the LDG on

oceanic islands. In other words, because of mutualism, islands showed a different global pattern

of biodiversity than mainlands (but see Pichler and Hartig, 2024). However, previous studies

have focused only on nutritional and pollination mutualisms.

Here, we expand on the analysis of Delavaux et al. (2024) in several ways. Most

importantly, we add trait data on another plant-animal mutualism: defensive ant-plant

mutualisms mediated by extrafloral nectaries (EFNs). Over 4000 plant species produce EFNs,

which are glands on plant parts other than inside flowers (Weber and Keeler, 2013). EFNs

secrete sugar-rich nectar that attracts mainly ants and sometimes other arthropods that usually

defend the plant from arthropod herbivores (Marazzi et al., 2013). Multiple meta-analyses across

plant species, families, and biogeographic regions have shown that EFNs generally reduce

herbivory and increase plant survival, growth, or reproductive success (Oliveira and Freitas

2004, Chamberlain and Holland 2009, Rosumek et al. 2009, Trager et al. 2010, Leal et al. 2023).

Ant-plant interactions mediated by EFNs are thus a type of facultative and generalized

mutualism—one in which the presence of the partner is usually not required for plant recruitment

and partners are highly interchangeable (Lach et al., 2010, Marazzi et al., 2013). Globally, the

richness of EFN-bearing plants follows the LDG (Luo et al., 2023). Phylogenetic studies have

also shown that in general, the origination of EFNs in a plant lineage promotes diversification

(Weber and Agrawal, 2014). This increase in diversity is expected because the presence of EFNs

promotes population growth by providing defense, which can result in greater ecological

opportunity leading to adaptive radiation. By the same token, EFNs may also accelerate plant

range expansion (Blüthgen and Reifenrath 2003, Nathan et al., 2023). More EFN-bearing plants

are legumes than any other plant family, and EFN-bearing legumes have spread to more new

regions of the globe than legumes that do not have EFNs (Nathan et al. 2023). Thus, unlike the

results of Delavaux et al. (2024) for plants that associate with mycorrhizae, N-fixing bacteria,

and animal pollinators, we predicted that EFN-bearing plants may experience enhanced

colonization on islands compared to plants that lack EFNs (Chomicki et al., 2019). If so, then

counter to Delavaux et al. (2024), mutualism does not always filter species richness on islands,

nor does it ubiquitously weaken the LDG on islands.

We also revisit the results of Delavaux et al. (2024) by accounting for plant phylogenetic

relationships, growth form (i.e., habit, or whether a plant is woody or herbaceous), and life

history, which were missing from their models of the species richness of mutualistic and non-

mutualistic plants on islands. Mutualism does not evolve independently of other functional traits,

making it challenging to disentangle the effects of mutualism from the effects of correlated traits

on island biogeography. For example, Delavaux et al. (2019, 2021, 2024) examined how

mycorrhizal fungi affect plant colonization on islands, but their models did not control for plant

habit, which may be associated with both mycorrhizal status and insularity. Non-mycorrhizal

plants are more often herbaceous, compared to ectomycorrhizal and arbuscular mycorrhizal

plants, which are more often woody trees or shrubs (Soudzilovskaia et al., 2020) and herbaceous

plants may be more likely than woody plants to colonize islands from mainlands (Schrader et al.

2020, 2025, see also Figure 1), although woodiness often evolves secondarily once herbaceous

lineages establish on islands (Nürk et al. 2019, Zizka et al. 2022, Figure 1). Thus, plant habit,

rather than mutualism *per se,* could explain the higher proportion of non-mycorrhizal plants on

islands than mainlands (Delavaux et al. 2019). We sought to determine whether the finding of a

mutualism filter on island plant diversity reported by Delavaux et al. (2019, 2021, 2022, 2024)

persists after controlling for traits correlated with mutualism that also influence plant

colonization on islands, especially plant habit and life history, and after accounting for the

phylogenetic non-independence of plant species. Finally, although there are a growing number of

studies of mutualism's effects on global plant biogeography, few studies explore how mutualism

shapes the global distribution of animals. We therefore also explored whether EFN-associated

ants differ from non-EFN-associated ants in their propensity to colonize islands, and whether the

richness of EFN-visiting ant taxa on islands is related to the richness of EFN-bearing plants.

These analyses add significantly to our understanding of the factors that influence plant and ant

diversity on oceanic islands.

Materials and methods

To examine the relationship between EFNs and plant colonization on islands, we used the Global

Inventory of Floras and Traits (GIFT) database (Weigelt et al., 2020) for plant occurrence

checklists, plant trait data (e.g., plant habit and life history), and geographic information and the

World List of Plants with Extrafloral Nectaries (Weber et al., 2024) for plant EFN trait data.

Figure 1 summarizes the raw plant trait data for species that occur on islands only (island

endemics), species that occur on both islands and mainlands (colonists), and species that never

occur on islands (mainland species). To determine whether visiting EFNs is associated with ant

colonization on islands, we used the Global Ant Biodiversity Index (GABI) database (Guenard et

al., 2017) and the Global Ant Biodiversity Index-Islands (GABI-I) database (Liu et al., 2023) for

ant occurrence and geographic information and data from Kaur et al. (2019) and Novais et al.

(2025) on which ant species visit EFNs. These data sources are also described in more detail in

Table 1 and in the supplemental appendix. All analyses were performed in R Studio using R

version 4.4.2 (R Studio R Core Team, 2024).

We fit two types of models to both the ant and the plant data: 1) species-level models in

which each data point is a species, and the (binary) response variable is whether it occurs on

islands, and 2) island-level models in which each data point is an island, and the (continuous)

response variable is the log response ratio of island species richness to mainland species

richness. We modelled the data two ways because the species-level models allowed us to account

for phylogeny and, for plants, other traits like habit and life history, but not island characteristics,

while the island-level models allowed us to account for the classical predictors of species

richness on islands like island size and isolation, but not phylogeny or species-level traits.

Previous work exploring the factors affecting island biodiversity has taken both approaches; for

example, Zell et al. (2024) modeled island presence/absence as a binary response variable and a

suite of species-level functional traits as predictors, while Delavaux et al. (2024) modelled what

they termed the 'island species deficit' (1 - the ratio of island to predicted mainland species

richness), which is very similar to the log(island species richness/mainland species richness)

metric we calculate here. We calculated log response ratios because of their well understood

statistical properties (Hedges et al. 1999).

For the species-level plant model, we used data from Delavaux et al. (2024), which

included a list of oceanic islands, vascular plant checklists, and trait data on associations with

animal pollinators, N-fixing bacteria, and mycorrhizae. We added EFN trait status from the

World List of Plants with Extrafloral Nectaries (Weber et al., 2024). We assumed that plants not

in the Weber et al. (2024) list did not have EFNs, as this list is the most complete in the literature

to date. As a result, we assigned an EFN trait status to all plant species in GIFT, with the result

that 1.5% of the plant species in GIFT have EFNs (Figure 1). For comparison, Weber and Keeler

(2013) estimate that EFNs occur in 2-3.6% of all flowering plant species.

In the species-level models, we treated island presence as a binary trait, such that each

species either occurs on one or more oceanic islands (1) or does not occur on any oceanic island

(0) and predictors estimate trait effects on island presence/absence. To account for the

phylogenetic non-independence of species, we reconstructed a phylogeny of all vascular plants

in the GIFT checklists using the R package V.Phylomaker2 (Jin & Qian, 2022) and then fit a

phylogenetically adjusted GLM with island presence/absence as the response variable and EFN

status, mycorrhizal association, nitrogen fixation, biotic pollination, plant habit, and plant life

history as predictors. We also fit a species-level model for ants examining island

presence/absence as a function of EFN association, using the ant phylogeny from Nelsen et al.

(2018). For both species-level models, we used the phylogenetically adjusted logistic regression

method of Ives and Garland (2010) as implemented in the phyloglm package in R.

For the island-level models, we needed to compare species richness between oceanic

islands and mainland sources of colonizing species. To obtain the set of oceanic islands, we used

data in Delavaux et al. (2024), which used the GIFT R package (Denelle et al., 2023) to extract

geographic data from the GIFT database, including information on island geological origins,

which distinguishes oceanic from non-oceanic islands. Following Delavaux et al. (2024), we

analyzed only oceanic islands because they were not originally part of a mainland, so they

represent unique archives of evolution and colonization. To have a measure of mainland species

richness against which to compare island species richness, Delavaux et al. (2024) interpolated

mainland species richness using only absolute latitude as a predictor. Pichler and Hartig (2024)

re-analysed the same data using random forest models parameterized with either latitude alone or

latitude and longitude to predict mainland species richness; however, they found no support for

mutualism dampening the LDG on oceanic islands with these models (but see Delavaux et al.,

2025). Instead of using a model to predict mainland species richness, we compared species

richness on oceanic islands with the observed species richness of their five most likely source

mainlands, calculated as the total number of unique species across the five mainlands (i.e., if a

species occurred in more than one of the five source mainlands, it was only counted once). To

identify the five most likely source mainlands for each island, we adopted the approach of König

et al. (2021). König et al. (2021) modelled species turnover as a function of both environmental

and geographic distance between islands and mainlands and then minimized species turnover to

predict the most likely source mainlands for each island in GIFT. For plants, we constrained the

possible source mainlands to those with vascular plant checklists available in GIFT, and for ants,

we use GABI geographic polygons as possible source mainlands. To model ant species turnover

between islands and mainlands and the correlation between ant and plant species richness on

islands (see below), we needed to associate the ant data from GABI and GABI-I with the GIFT

geographic entities and their environmental metadata. We spatially joined ant occurrence data

from GABI and GABI-I to the geographic data in GIFT by latitude/longitude. Ant occurrence

data in GABI-I had latitudes and longitudes that sometimes differed from the coordinates

supplied for islands in GIFT. We used the sf package (Pebesma, 2023) in R to generate a

distance matrix between each island as represented in GIFT and in GABI-I, using the minimum

distance to pair GABI-I and GIFT islands, and then used a 1km distance cutoff for a pair to be

treated as the same island.

In order to exclude understudied species in which the presence or especially the absence

of a mutualistic trait might be unreliable (Chamberlain et al., 2022), for both plants and ants, we

used species occurrence records from the Global Biodiversity Information Facility (GBIF,

package rgbif, Chamberlain et al., 2022) to filter out species that are very rare (< 100 GBIF

occurrences). We present results with this filter applied below, but there were almost no

differences in statistical significance or direction of effect in models with versus without this

filter, except for the interaction effect between latitude and EFN status in the island-level plant

model that was non-significant with the filter (Table 3) but statistically significant without it

(Table S3).

When testing for a mutualism filter on island colonization (as in Delavaux et al., 2024),

the most relevant species on islands are those present in their likely source mainlands (Konig et

al., 2021). As such, we required that for an island species to be counted, it had to be present in at

least one of that island's five most likely source mainlands. This excluded island endemics,

which likely originated via speciation on islands and not as colonists from mainlands, as well as

island species that arrived from mainlands not captured in our source pool for each island; for

comparison, we also include models with all island species in the supplemental material (Table

S1 and Figures S1 and S2).

For each island, we calculated the log response ratio (LRR) of island to source mainland

species richness for plants with and without EFNs and ants that do or not visit EFNs and then fit

generalized linear models (GLMs) separately for the ant and plant trait data. Because log

response ratios can be calculated only from positive, non-zero values, we added a constant of 1

to all count data. The main predictor of interest was whether plants have EFNs, or ants visit

EFNs. Additional biogeographical and climatic variables in the models included absolute latitude

of the island in each island-mainland group, average distance from island to source mainlands,

island area and elevational range, average mainland area and elevational range, and mean annual

precipitation on the island. We log-transformed all geographic variables to improve normality of

the residuals.

Finally, to examine the relationship between plant and ant species richness, we also fit

separate GLMs with the island species richness of either EFN-visiting or non-EFN-visiting ants

as response variables and the species richness of EFN-bearing and non-EFN bearing plants, as

well as biogeographical variables, as predictors. These models tested whether the diversity of ant

defenders is correlated with the diversity of plants with EFNs, which would be expected if ant

diversity begets plant diversity, or *vice versa,* thanks to ant-plant mutualisms mediated by EFNs..

Results

Visualizing the raw trait data shows that among the 77,874 plant species in GIFT with

appropriate trait data, island colonists (species that occur on both islands and mainlands) are

more likely to be pollinated by abiotic agents (especially wind), to be non-mycorrhizal, and to

265 lack nitrogen-fixing symbionts than mainland-only plant species, recapitulating the general

266 finding of Delavaux et al. (2024) that these plant mutualisms are less well represented on oceanic

267 islands than on mainlands (Figure 1). However, island colonists are more likely, not less likely,

268 to have EFNs (Figure 1). Interestingly, island endemics are more likely to be biotically

269 pollinated, mycorrhizal plants that lack EFNs and nitrogen-fixing symbionts than island colonists

270 (Figure 1).

271  Figure 1 also reveals that island colonists are more often herbaceous annuals than either

272 island endemics or mainland-only plant species, meaning it is important to control for plant habit

273 and life history when modelling the influence of plant mutualisms on island colonization. We fit

274 a species-level model to the plant data that included these traits and the four mutualism-related

275 plant traits, and confirmed that, indeed, plants on oceanic islands are significantly more likely to

276 be herbaceous annuals, compared to woody or perennial plants (Table 2). In this model, EFN-

277 bearing plants were also significantly more likely to occur on oceanic islands than plants without

278 EFNs (Table 2), as were plants with arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi; for AMF, this is the opposite

279 of what Delavaux et al. (2024) found, but they did not account for plant habit and life history.

280 Nonetheless, consistent with Delavaux et al. (2024), biotically pollinated plants were

281 significantly under-represented on islands, compared to abiotically pollinated plants (Table 2,

282 Figure 2). There was no significant effect of nitrogen-fixing symbionts on island presence (Table

283 2, Figure 2). In the ant species-level analysis, EFN-visiting ants were also significantly more

284 likely to occur on oceanic islands than ant species that do not visit EFNs (Table 2). There was

285 also phylogenetic signal for whether ant and plant species occur on islands, with ants having

286 stronger phylogenetic signal for insularity than plants (see Table 2 for alphas).

The mainland-island grouping procedure yielded 169 groups (of one oceanic island and

five likely source mainlands) for plants (Figure 3A) and 178 for ants (Figure 4A). The number of

mainland-island groups differed between plants and ants because of differences in data

coverage. Log response ratios of island to mainland species richness were always negative,

reflecting the well-known deficit of species on islands relative to mainlands (Carlquist, 1974). In

the island-level plant model, EFN-bearing plants were again over-represented on oceanic islands,

meaning they were more likely to occur on oceanic islands than plant species without EFNs

(Table 3A, Figure 3B); the LRR of island to mainland species richness was less negative for

plants with than without EFNs, indicating a smaller island species deficit for plants with EFNs.

For plants, islands that were farther from their source mainlands, smaller islands, islands with

smaller source mainlands, and drier islands all had larger species deficits compared to mainlands

(i.e., more negative LRRs of island to mainland species richness) (Table 3A).

In the island-level plant model, there was also a significantly positive main effect of

latitude, meaning that tropical islands are more plant species-poor relative to tropical mainlands

than are temperate islands relative to temperate mainlands (Table 3A, Figure 3B). In this model,

in which we filtered the data to exclude very rare species for which trait data may be unreliable,

there was no significant interaction between latitude and EFN status, indicating that the effect of

EFNs on island plant species richness does not vary with latitude (Table 3A, Figure 3B). In

contrast, when we did not filter out rare plant species using a minimum cutoff of 100 GBIF

occurrences, there was a statistically significant interaction between latitude and EFN status,

such that the effect of EFNs on the LRR of island to mainland species richness is most positive at

the equator and less positive at high latitudes (i.e., a negative EFN x latitude effect on the LRR,

Table S3A, Figure 3B). Thus, in the unfiltered data, EFNs increase island plant species richness

more near the equator than near the poles, and thereby strengthen the LDG on oceanic islands. In

other words, EFNs either have no effect or strengthen the LDG for plant species on oceanic

islands, depending on how the data are filtered.

In the island-level ant model, EFN-visiting ants were also over-represented on islands

(Table 3B, Figure 4B); the LRR of island to mainland species richness was less negative for ants

that visit EFNs than for ants that do not visit EFNs. Island area was also a significant predictor in

the island-level ant model, again with smaller islands having a larger species deficit, as

evidenced by a more negative LRR of island to mainland species richness (Table 3B). For ants,

there was a significant negative interaction between island latitude and EFN visitation, in both

the filtered (Table 3B) and unfiltered (Table S3B) data. Thus, regardless of how we filtered the

ant data, visiting EFNs strengthened the LDG for ant species on oceanic islands (Table 3B,

Figure 4B).

Because species that occur only on islands, which we assume to be endemics, differ from

island colonists in mutualistic traits (Figure 1), in Table 3, we modelled the log response ratio of

island to mainland species richness including only island species that also occur on a

corresponding mainland and likely arrived from there as colonists. When we included all island

species, adding island endemics and island species originating from beyond the most likely

source mainlands, a significantly positive effect of EFN trait status remained for ants, but not

plants (Table S1, Figures S1 and S2). In these models, EFN trait status never interacted

significantly with latitude, for either ants or plants (Table S1). Thus, including island endemics,

which have different traits than colonists (Figure 1), obscures the relationships among EFNs,

island colonization, and latitude that emerge when we limit our analyses to species that colonize

islands from mainlands (as in Table 3).

Across oceanic islands, the species richness of island ants that visit EFNs was correlated

with the species richness of plants with EFNs, but not with the species richness of plants that do

not have EFNs (Table S2A, Figure S3). In contrast, the species richness of ants that do not visit

EFNs was significantly correlated with the species richness of non-EFN-bearing plants, but not

with the richness of plants with EFNs (Table S2B, Figure S3). The richness of EFN-visiting ants,

but not other ants, on islands followed the typical latitudinal diversity gradient (e.g. Willig,

2003), with more species in the tropics than at high latitudes, and there were also more species of

EFN-visiting ants on larger islands and islands nearer to mainlands (Table S2A). The richness of

ant species that do not visit EFNs was significantly predicted by only the richness of non-EFN-

bearing plants and by annual precipitation, with wetter islands having more non-EFN-visiting ant

species (Table S2B).

Discussion

Ant-plant mutualisms mediated by EFNs are generalized and facultative (Marazzi et al., 2013),

and previous work has shown that this mutualism facilitates plant and ant introductions to new

ranges (Nathan et al., 2023) and spurs plant diversification (Weber and Agrawal, 2014). As such,

we expected that, contrary to Delavaux et al. (2024), this mutualism type would not act as a filter

on the diversity of colonizing species on oceanic islands, and might instead enhance island

colonization from mainlands. The results of both the species- and island-level models support

our prediction; plants that have EFNs and ants that visit EFNs are over-represented on oceanic

islands, compared to taxa lacking these traits. Furthermore, in the island-level models, the

positive effect of this ant-plant mutualism on island colonization either does not vary

latitudinally (Table 3A) or increases towards the equator (Table 3B, Table S3), meaning that

engaging in mutualism mediated by EFNs either has no effect or intensifies, but never weakens,

the LDG on islands. Nathan et al. (2025) found that the castor bean, *Ricinus communis*, invested

more in EFNs in lower than higher latitudes, and that more ants recruited to these EFNs nearer

the equator. Our results find support for this pattern of higher representation of ant-plant

mutualisms mediated by EFNs at lower latitudes globally, in agreement with the Biotic

Interactions Hypothesis (BIH) (Schemske et al., 2009). Finally, the richness of EFN-visiting ants

and EFN-bearing plants positively covary across oceanic islands, suggesting that the mutualistic

ant and plant taxa that interact via EFNs either respond in similar ways to climatic or other

environmental variation among islands, or are subject to positive feedback fueled by the

mutualism itself.

The raw proportions of mutualistic versus non-mutualistic taxa vary among island

endemics, colonists, and mainland plant species in ways that are consistent with Delavaux et. al

(2021, 2022, 2024); colonists are less likely than mainland plant species to have animal

pollinators, mycorrhizae, and rhizobia (Figure 1). However, colonists are more likely than

mainland species to have EFNs (Figure 1), suggesting that not all mutualism types affect island

colonization equally, as further supported by the species- and island-level models. In contrast to

the study by Delavaux et al. (2024), which fit only island-level models that did not account for

other plant traits beyond mutualism, we fit a species-level model that included not only

mutualism-related traits, but also plant habit and life history as covariates. Unsurprisingly, these

covariates significantly predicted insularity; herbaceous, annual plants are over-represented on

islands, compared to woody, perennial plants (Figure 1, Table 2). After controlling for plant

habit and life history, biotic pollination still had a negative effect on whether plant species live

on islands, as in Delavaux et al. (2024), but the effect of nitrogen-fixing symbionts was non-

significant, and the effects of arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi and EFNs were significantly positive

(Table 2, Figure 2); plants with EFNs and arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi are significantly more

likely, not less likely to occur on on oceanic islands than non-EFN and non-mycorrhizal plant

species. These findings cast doubt on the generality of the mutualism filter on island plant

diversity reported by Delavaux et al. (2024).

In the species-level model, biotic pollination still significantly reduced the likelihood that

a plant species occurs on islands, compared to abiotic pollination, and indeed Delavaux et al.

(2024) found that biotic pollination results in the largest island species deficit among the

mutualism types they examined. Delavaux et al. (2024) ascribe this mutualism filter on island

colonization to "the reduced likelihood of simultaneous co-colonization of partners" on islands.

However, this mechanism should mainly affect plants that are highly specialized on a specific

taxon of animal pollinator, whereas most plant-pollinator interactions are highly generalized and

dynamic (Waser et al., 1996). Some mutualisms can also re-assemble even if colonization by the

partners is not simultaneous (Hembry and Tocora, 2025). Nonetheless, the idea that animal

pollination is less reliable on islands than on mainlands is old and has solid empirical support;

both selfing and wind pollination can be favored on islands (Barrett 1996, Grossenbacher et al.

2017). Wind pollination may be favored not only because of a dearth of animal pollinators, but

also because open, wind-swept coastal habitats on islands favor plant groups, like grasses, in

which wind pollination is widespread (Barrett et al. 1996, Friedman and Barrett, 2009).

Delavaux et al. (2024) did not distinguish between taxa that arrived on islands from

elsewhere and taxa that have radiated on islands–i.e., whether a plant species has allochthonous

or autochthonous origins. For the island-level models, we excluded potentially autochthonous

island endemics because they do not give information about the limits to colonization; instead

they may reflect the evolutionary drivers on the island itself, although endemics still evolve from

successful colonists, and so may retain their traits. Comparing the traits of island endemics and

colonists, as in Figure 1, reveals differences in their mutualism-related traits; mutualism may

affect the process of dispersing to and establishing on an island differently from how mutualistic

traits and taxa subsequently evolve on islands. For example, while reduced dependence on

animal pollinators might favor island colonization, adaptive radiation and diversification on

islands might depend on 'escaping homozygosity' by outcrossing (Barrett 1996); this is

consistent with the greater proportion of biotically pollinated plants among island endemics than

island colonists in Figure 1. Similarly, although plant species arriving on islands from mainlands

are more likely to have EFNs than plants that do not colonize islands (Tables 2A and 3A), island

endemics are less likely to have EFNs than colonists or mainland taxa (Figure 1), consistent with

previous work that has found that some island endemics have lost EFNs (Sugiura et al. 2026),

perhaps because of reduced herbivory or ant abundances on some oceanic islands (e.g., in

Hawaii, Keeler 1985). When we observe a species living on islands as having particular traits, it

reflects the end result of multiple processes, including dispersal, successful establishment in the

face of abiotic factors and biotic interactions, and subsequent adaptation and speciation on

islands (Losos and Ricklefs, 2009), that are difficult to capture in coarse comparisons of the traits

of island and mainland taxa. Mutualism is likely to impact many of these processes, shaping

island faunas and floras.

We also added a new mutualism type to the Delavaux et al. (2024) analysis: the

mutualism between plants with EFNs and their ant defenders. Although this mutualism type is

much rarer among plants than biotic pollination (Figure 1), these two mutualisms have similar

effect sizes on insularity (Table 2, coefficient for biotic pollination is -1.19, compared to +0.91

for EFNs), meaning that they have almost equivalent effects on shaping island floras, albeit in

opposite directions. In other words, the coefficients of the species-level model indicate that a

biotically pollinated plant with EFNs is almost equally likely to live on islands as an abiotically

pollinated plant without EFN, although we base this interpretation assuming strictly additive

effects of EFNs and biotic pollination on island colonization, since we did not test for interactive

effects of mutualistic traits (see more below). Similarly, in the island-level models, mutualism

via EFNs positively predicts both ant and plant species richness on islands. Afkhami et al. (2014)

proposed that defensive mutualisms, by protecting organisms from biotic interactions with

negative fitness consequences, might facilitate range expansion, and Nathan et al. (2023) found

evidence of this pattern in legumes that have EFNs and ant defenders. Establishment on an island

involves both colonization and niche expansion, and generalist mutualists, such as in defensive

ant-plant mutualisms mediated by EFNs, may be more likely to undergo both the expansion and

ecological release phases of species establishment (Chomicki et al., 2019). Alternatively, rather

than helping taxa colonize islands, species engaged in ant-plant mutualisms might be

overrepresented on islands because they have larger population sizes and therefore reduced

extinction rates (Weber and Agrawal, 2014).

Because there are few plant taxa with some combinations of mutualistic traits (e.g., very

few plants have no mutualisms at all, see Figure 1), we did not explore the interactive effects of

multiple mutualisms on insularity or island species richness. However, plants very commonly

participate simultaneously or sequentially in multiple mutualisms, which can have non-additive

ecological or evolutionary effects (Afkhami et al., 2014, Primieri et al., 2022, Laurich et al.,

2023). For example, legumes with extrafloral nectaries that attract ants may also have some

combination of rhizobia, mycorrhizae, and animal pollinators (Nathan et al., 2023). Even if biotic

pollination constrains island colonization, the net result of multiple mutualisms on insularity

might be positive, given that the positive effects of EFNs and mycorrhizae on insularity swamp

the negative effect of biotic pollination in Table 2. However, multiple mutualisms could also

result in non-additive effects on island species richness that are difficult to predict.

Mutualism can beget or hinder species diversity in ecological communities, with effects

often depending on whether the benefits of mutualism are private to only one or a few

community members, or widely available to many species (Bshary 2003, Frederickson et al.,

2005, Rudgers and Clay, 2008). We examined the correlation between ant and plant species

richness across oceanic islands, and found that the species richness of EFN-visiting ants was

significantly predicted by the species richness of EFN-bearing plants, but not by plant diversity

more generally. In contrast, the species richness of ants that do not visit EFNs was significantly

predicted by non-EFN plant richness, but not the richness of EFN-bearing plants. These

correlations suggest that ant and plant species that engage in mutualism via EFNs either respond

more similarly to environmental variation across islands than, for example, EFN-visiting ants

and non-EFN plant species, or that the establishment of one mutualist on an island accelerates

the establishment of other mutualists in a process akin to invasional meltdown (Simberloff and

Von Holle, 1999, Prior et al., 2015). However, the benefits of this kind of positive feedback

appear restricted to plant and ant species that directly participate in the mutualism. In a global

biogeographic analysis of ant-plant mutualisms, Luo et al. (2023) also found that the presence of

potential ant partners was a driver of EFN-bearing plant species richness, suggesting that the

pattern we observed might hold on both islands and mainlands.

Understanding what factors shape biodiversity on islands is critical because islands have

unique biotas and island species are more vulnerable to extinction than mainland species (Losos

and Ricklefs, 2009, Whittaker et al., 2017). We wholeheartedly agree with Delavaux et al. (2024)

that mutualism plays an underappreciated role in island biogeography, but our findings suggest

that mutualism does not universally filter island species richness, weakening the LDG. Instead,

the facultative, generalized mutualism between ants and EFN-bearing plants is associated with

increased insularity and island species richness. Furthermore, after accounting for phylogeny and

other plant functional traits, only biotic pollination, and not mutualism with mycorrhizae or

nitrogen-fixing symbionts, appears to reduce plant colonization of oceanic islands. Because

mutualism links the fates of interacting species, mutualism makes key contributions to global

biodiversity patterns, but most plant mutualisms do not prevent species from living on tropical

islands as Delavaux et al. (2024) claimed.

References

Afkhami, M. E., McIntyre, P. J., & Strauss, S. Y. (2014). Mutualist-mediated effects on species'

range limits across large geographic scales. *Ecol. Lett.*, 17(10), 1265-1273.

Afkhami, M. E., Rudgers, J. A., & Stachowicz, J. J. (2014). Multiple mutualist effects: conflict

and synergy in multispecies mutualisms. *Ecology*, 95(4), 833-844.

Barrett, S. C. H. (1996). The reproductive biology and genetics of island plants. *Philos. Trans. R.*

Soc. B., 351(1341), 725-733.

Blüthgen, N., & Reifenrath, K. (2003). Extrafloral nectaries in an Australian rainforest: structure

and distribution. *Australian Journal of Botany*, *51*(5), 515-527.

Bshary, R. (2003). The cleaner wrasse, Labroides dimidiatus, is a key organism for reef fish

diversity at Ras Mohammed National Park, Egypt. *J. Anim. Ecol.*, 72(1), 169-176.

Carlquist, S. J. (1974). *Island biology*. Columbia University Press.

Chamberlain, S. A., & Holland, J. N. (2009). Quantitative synthesis of context dependency in

ant–plant protection mutualisms. Ecology, 90(9), 2384-2392.

Chamberlain, S., Oldoni, D., & Waller, J. (2022). rgbif: interface to the global biodiversity

information facility API.

Chomicki, G., Weber, M., Antonelli, A., Bascompte, J., & Kiers, E. T. (2019). The Impact of

Mutualisms on Species Richness. *TREE*, 34(8), 698-711.

Delavaux, C. S. (2025). On the role of mutualisms in plant biogeography: consequences for

ecology, evolution, and invasion. *New Phytologist*.

Delavaux, C. S., Crowther, T. W., Bever, J. D. & Gora, E. M. (2025). Response to comment on

"Mutualisms weaken the latitudinal diversity gradient among oceanic islands. *arXiv*

preprint arXiv:2411.15105

Delavaux, C. S., Crowther, T. W., Bever, J. D., Weigelt, P., & Gora, E. M. (2024). Mutualisms

weaken the latitudinal diversity gradient among oceanic islands. *Nat.*, 627(8003), 335-339.

Delavaux, C. S., Crowther, T. W., Bever, J. D., Weigelt, P., & Gora, E. M. (2024). Data from:

Mutualisms weaken the latitudinal diversity gradient among oceanic islands. GitHub

Digital Repository. Available at: https://github.com/c383d893/IslandLDG.

Delavaux, C. S., Weigelt, P., Dawson, W., Duchicela, J., Essl, F., van Kleunen, M., ... & Bever,

J. D. (2019). *Mycorrhizal fungi influence global plant biogeography. Nat Ecol Evol 3:*

424–429

Delavaux, C. S., Weigelt, P., Dawson, W., Essl, F., van Kleunen, M., König, C. *et al*. (2021).

Mycorrhizal types influence island biogeography of plants. *Commun. Biol.*, 4(1), 1128-

1128.

Delavaux, C. S., Weigelt, P., Magnoli, S. M., Kreft, H., Crowther, T. W., & Bever, J. D. (2022).

Nitrogen-fixing symbiotic bacteria act as a global filter for plant establishment on islands.

Commun. Biol., 5(1), 1209-1209.

Denelle, P., Weigelt, P., & Kreft, H. (2023). GIFT—An R package to access the Global

Inventory of Floras and Traits. *Methods Ecol Evol*, 14(11), 2738-2748.

Etienne, R. S., Cabral, J. S., Hagen, O., Hartig, F., Hurlbert, A. H., Pellissier, L. *et al*. (2019). A

minimal model for the latitudinal diversity gradient suggests a dominant role for ecological

limits. *Am. Nat*., 194(5), E122-E133.

Fowler, J. C., Donald, M. L., Bronstein, J. L., & Miller, T. E. (2023). The geographic footprint of

mutualism: How mutualists influence species' range limits. *Ecol. Monogr.*, 93(1), e1558.

Frederickson, M. E., Greene, M. J., & Gordon, D. M. (2005). 'Devil's gardens' bedevilled by

ants. *Nature*, 437(7058), 495-496.

Friedman, J., & Barrett, S. C. (2009). Wind of change: new insights on the ecology and evolution

of pollination and mating in wind-pollinated plants. *Ann. Bot.*, 103(9), 1515-1527.

Grossenbacher, D.L., Brandvain, Y., Auld, J.R., Burd, M., Cheptou, P.-O., Conner, J.K., Grant,

A.G., Hovick, S.M., Pannell, J.R., Pauw, A., Petanidou, T., Randle, A.M., Rubio de Casas,

R., Vamosi, J., Winn, A., Igic, B., Busch, J.W., Kalisz, S. and Goldberg, E.E. (2017), Self-

compatibility is over-represented on islands. *New Phytol.,* 215: 469-478.

Guenard, B., Weiser, M., Gomez, K., Narula, N., & Economo, E. P. (2017). The Global Ant

Biodiversity Informatics (GABI) database: synthesizing data on the geographic distribution

of ant species (Hymenoptera: Formicidae). *Myrmecol. News*, 24, 83-89.

Hedges, L. V., Gurevitch, J., & Curtis, P. S. (1999). The meta-analysis of response ratios in

experimental ecology. *Ecology*, *80*(4), 1150-1156.

Hembry, D. H., & Tocora, M. C. (2025). Biogeography of Interactions. In Reference Module in

Life Sciences. Elsevier.

Hillebrand, H. (2004). On the Generality of the Latitudinal Diversity Gradient. *Am. Nat.*, 163(2),

192-211.

Ho LST, Ane C (2014). "A linear-time algorithm for Gaussian and non-Gaussian trait evolution

models." *Syst. Biol.*, 63, 397-408.

Ives, A. R., & Garland Jr, T. (2010). Phylogenetic logistic regression for binary dependent

variables. *Syst. Biol.*, 59(1), 9-26.

Kaiser-Bunbury, C. N., Traveset, A., & Hansen, D. M. (2010). Conservation and restoration of

plant–animal mutualisms on oceanic islands. *PPEES*, 12(2), 131-143.

Kaur, K. M., Malé, P.-J. G., Spence, E., Gomez, C., & Frederickson, M. E. (2019). Using text-

mined trait data to test for cooperate-and-radiate co-evolution between ants and plants.

PLoS Comput. Biol., 15(10), e1007323.

Kaur, K. M., Malé, P.-J. G., Spence, E., Gomez, C., & Frederickson, M. E. (2019). Data from

Using text-mined trait data to test for cooperate-and-radiate co-evolution between ants

and plants. Dryad Digital Repository. Available at: https://doi.org/10.5061/dryad.3630t8j.

Keeler, K. H. (1985). Extrafloral nectaries on plants in communities without ants: Hawaii. *Oikos*,

407-414.

Kinlock, N. L., Prowant, L., Herstoff, E. M., Foley, C. M., Akin-Fajiye, M., Bender, N. *et al*.

(2018). Explaining global variation in the latitudinal diversity gradient: Meta-analysis

confirms known patterns and uncovers new ones. *Glob. Ecol. Biogeogr.*, 27(1/2), 125-141.

König, C., Weigelt, P., Taylor, A., Stein, A., Dawson, W., Essl, F. *et al*. (2021). Source pools

and disharmony of the world's island floras. *Ecography*, 44(1), 44-55.

König, C., Weigelt, P., Taylor, A., Stein, A., Dawson, W., Essl, F. *et al*. (2021). Data from:

Source pools and disharmony of the world's island floras. Dryad Digital Repository.

Available at: https://doi.org/10.5061/dryad.6wwpzgmwm.

Lach, L., Tillberg, C. V., & Suarez, A. V. (2010). Contrasting effects of an invasive ant on a

native and an invasive plant. *Biological Invasions*, *12*(9), 3123-3133.

Laurich, J. R., Reid, C. G., Biel, C., Wu, T., Knox, C., & Frederickson, M. E. (2023). Genetic

architecture of multiple mutualisms and mating system in Turnera ulmifolia. *J. Evol. Biol.*,

36(1), 280-295.

Leal, L. C., Nogueira, A., & Peixoto, P. E. (2023). Which traits optimize plant benefits? Meta-

analysis on the effect of partner traits on the outcome of an ant–plant protective mutualism.

J. Ecol., 111(1), 263-275.

Liu, C., Economo, E. P., & Guénard, B. (2023). GABI-I: The global ant biodiversity informatics-

island database. In: Wiley Online Library.

Liu, C., Economo, E. P., & Guénard, B. (2023). Data from: GABI-I: *The global ant biodiversity*

informatics-island database. Figshare Digital Repository. Available at:

https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.21701285.

Losos, J. B., & Ricklefs, R. E. (2009). Adaptation and diversification on islands. *Nature*,

457(7231), 830-836.

Luo, Y., Taylor, A., Weigelt, P., Guénard, B., Economo, E. P., Nowak, A., Inderjit *et al*. (2023).

Climate and ant diversity explain the global distribution of ant-plant mutualisms.

Ecography, e06841.

MacArthur, R. H., & Wilson, E. O. (2001). *The theory of island biogeography* (Vol. 1).

Princeton university press.

Marazzi, B., Bronstein, J. L., & Koptur, S. (2013). Diversity, ecology and evolution of

extrafloral nectaries: current perspectives and future challenges. *Ann. Bot.*, 111(6), 1243-

1250.

Mittelbach, G. G., Schemske, D. W., Cornell, H. V., Allen, A. P., Brown, J. M., Bush, M. B. *et*

al. (2007). Evolution and the latitudinal diversity gradient: speciation, extinction and

biogeography. *Ecol. Lett.*, 10(4), 315-331.

Nathan, P., Economo, E. P., Guénard, B., Simonsen, A. K., & Frederickson, M. E. (2023).

Generalized mutualisms promote range expansion in both plant and ant partners. *Proc. R.*

Soc. B., 290(2006), 20231083.

Nathan, P., Economo, E. P., Guénard, B., Simonsen, A. K., & Frederickson, M. E. (2023). Data

from *Generalized mutualisms promote range expansion in both plant and ant partners*.

Dryad Digital Repository. Available at: https://doi.org/10.5061/dryad.jm63xsjh6.

Nathan, P., Shahid, A., Datta, A., Gowda, V., & Frederickson, M. E. (2025). Are ant-plant

mutualisms stronger at lower latitudes? A case study using the castor bean plant.

Oecologia, *207*(8), 130.

Nelsen, M. P., Ree, R. H., & Moreau, C. S. (2018). Ant–plant interactions evolved through

increasing interdependence. *PNAS*, 115(48), 12253-12258.

Nelsen, M. P., Ree, R. H., & Moreau, C. S. (2018). Data from *Ant–plant interactions evolved*

through increasing interdependence. Dryad Digital Repository. Available at:

https://datadryad.org/dataset/doi:10.5061/dryad.ft4sn88.

Novais, S., Matías-Ferrer, N., Ruíz-Guerra, B., Pereira, C. C., Negreiros, D., & Aguirre-Jaimes,

A. (2025). Ants and extrafloral nectary-bearing plants: A dataset of interactions and

outcomes. *Ecology*, 106(9), e70186.

Nürk, N. M., Atchison, G. W., & Hughes, C. E. (2019). Island woodiness underpins accelerated

disparification in plant radiations. *New Phytologist*, 224(1), 518-531.

Oliveira, P. S., & Freitas, A. V. (2004). Ant–plant–herbivore interactions in the neotropical

cerrado savanna. *Naturwissenschaften*, 91(12), 557-570.

Pebesma, E., & Bivand, R. (2023). *Spatial data science : with applications in R* (First edition

ed.). CRC Press.

Pichler, M., & Hartig, F. (2024). Is there a robust effect of mainland mutualism rates on species

richness of oceanic islands? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.15105*.

Pichler, M., & Hartig, F. (2024). Data from: *Is there a robust effect of mainland mutualism rates*

on species richness of oceanic islands?. GitHub Digital Repository. Available at:

https://github.com/MaximilianPi/IslandLDG.

Primieri, S., Magnoli, S.M., Koffel, T., Stürmer, S.L. and Bever, J.D. (2022), Perennial, but not

annual legumes synergistically benefit from infection with arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi

and rhizobia: a meta-analysis. *New Phytol.,* 233: 505-514.

Prior, K. M., Robinson, J. M., Meadley Dunphy, S. A., & Frederickson, M. E. (2015). Mutualism

between co-introduced species facilitates invasion and alters plant community structure.

Proc. R. Soc. B, 282(1800), 20142846.

Rosumek, F. B., Silveira, F. A., de S. Neves, F., de U. Barbosa, N. P., Diniz, L., Oki, Y., Pezzini,

F. *et al*. (2009). Ants on plants: a meta-analysis of the role of ants as plant biotic defenses.

Oecologia, 160, 537-549.

Rudgers, J. A., & Clay, K. (2008). An invasive plant–fungal mutualism reduces arthropod

diversity. *Ecol. Lett.*, 11(8), 831-840.

Schemske, D. W., Mittelbach, G. G., Cornell, H. V., Sobel, J. M., & Roy, K. (2009). Is There a

Latitudinal Gradient in the Importance of Biotic Interactions? *Annu. Rev. Ecol. Evol. Syst.*,

40(1), 245-269.

Schrader, J., Coleman, D., Zelený, D., Kreft, H., & Westoby, M. (2025). Resurveyed Island

Vegetation Reveals That Species Colonisation and Extinction Probabilities Are Linked to

Traits. *Ecology Letters*, *28*(10), e70223.

Schrader, J., König, C., Triantis, K. A., Trigas, P., Kreft, H., & Weigelt, P. (2020). Species–area

relationships on small islands differ among plant growth forms. *Global Ecology and*

Biogeography, *29*(5), 814-829.

Simberloff, D., & Von Holle, B. (1999). Positive interactions of nonindigenous species:

invasional meltdown?. *Biol. Invasions*, 1(1), 21-32.

Soudzilovskaia, N. A. et al. FungalRoot: global online database of plant mycorrhizal

associations. *New Phytol.* 227, 955–966 (2020).

Sugiura, S., Abe, T., & Makino, S. I. (2006). Loss of extrafloral nectary on an oceanic island

plant and its consequences for herbivory. *American Journal of Botany*, *93*(3), 491-495.

Tedersoo, L., Bahram, M., & Zobel, M. (2020). How mycorrhizal associations drive plant

population and community biology. *Sci*, 367(6480).

Trager, M. D., Bhotika, S., Hostetler, J. A., Andrade, G. V., Rodriguez-Cabal, M. A., McKeon,

C. S. *et al*. (2010). Benefits for plants in ant-plant protective mutualisms: a meta-analysis.

PLoS One, 5(12), e14308.

Waser, N. M., Chittka, L., Price, M. V., Williams, N. M., & Ollerton, J. (1996). Generalization in

pollination systems, and why it matters. *Ecology*, 77(4), 1043-1060.

Weber, M., Porturas, L., & Keeler, K. (2024). *World list of plants with extrafloral nectaries*.

Available at: http://www.extrafloralnectaries.org/. Last accessed 14 08 2025.

Weber, M. G., & Agrawal, A. A. (2014). Defense mutualisms enhance plant diversification.

PNAS, 111(46), 16442-16447.

Weber, M. G., & Keeler, K. H. (2013). The phylogenetic distribution of extrafloral nectaries in

plants. *Ann. Bot.*, 111(6), 1251-1261.

Weigelt, P., König, C., & Kreft, H. (2020). GIFT–A global inventory of floras and traits for

macroecology and biogeography. *J. Biogeogr.*, 47(1), 16-43.

Werner, G. D., Cornwell, W. K., Sprent, J. I., Kattge, J. & Kiers, E. T. A single evolutionary

innovation drives the deep evolution of symbiotic N_2-fixation in angiosperms. *Nat.*

Commun. 5, 4087 (2014).

Whittaker, R. J., Fernández-Palacios, J. M., Matthews, T. J., Borregaard, M. K., & Triantis, K.

A. (2017). Island biogeography: Taking the long view of nature's laboratories. *Science,*

357(6354), 885–885.

Willig, M. R., Kaufman, D. M., & Stevens, R. D. (2003). Latitudinal gradients of biodiversity:

pattern, process, scale, and synthesis. *Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution, and*

Systematics, 34(1), 273-309.

Zeng, Y., & Wiens, J. J. (2021). Species interactions have predictable impacts on diversification.

Ecol. Lett., 24(2), 239-248.

Zizka, A., Onstein, R. E., Rozzi, R., Weigelt, P., Kreft, H., Steinbauer, M. J., ... & Lens, F.

(2022). The evolution of insular woodiness. *Proceedings of the National Academy of*

Sciences, 119(37), e2208629119.

Figures

677 **Figure 1.** Plant traits among island endemics, island colonists, and mainland species after

678 combining data from GIFT and Weber et al. (2024).

Figure 2. Proportions of plant (A-D) or ant (E) species that occur on islands, for plant species

that A) are biotically versus abiotically pollinated, B) do or do not have EFNs, C) associate with

arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi (AMF), ectomycorrhizal fungi (ecto), or are non-mycorrhizal

(none), and D) do or do not associate with nitrogen-fixing symbionts, and for ant species that E)

do or not visit EFNs.

689 **Figure 3.** A) Map of five likely source mainlands (red) for each island (blue) for plants. B) Plot

690 of log response ratio of island to mainland species richness for EFN- (purple) and non-EFN-

691 bearing (green) plants against absolute latitude of the island.

Figure 4. A) Map of five likely source mainlands (red) for each island (blue) for ants. B) Plot of

log response ratio of island to mainland species richness for EFN-visiting (purple) and non-EFN-

visiting (green) ants against absolute latitude of the island.

 Tables

 Table 1. Summary of data sources and citations for geographic occurrence and trait data.

Taxa	Data type	Data source	Citation
Vascular plants	Mainland and island occurrences	Global Inventory of Floras and Traits (GIFT)	Weigelt et al. (2020)
	Traits: plant habit, plant life history, biotic pollination	Global Inventory of Floras and Traits (GIFT)	Weigelt et al. (2020)
	Traits: mycorrhizal status	FungalRoot Database	Soudzilovskala, et al. (2020)
	Traits: N-fixing status	N-fixing plant database	Werner et al. (2014)
	Traits: list of vascular plant species with extrafloral nectaries (EFNs)	World List of Plants with Extrafloral Nectaries	Weber et al. (2024)
Ants	Lists of ant species in spatial polygons that correspond to countries or geopolitical regions (e.g., states, provinces, etc.)	Global Ant Biodiversity Index (GABI)	Guenard et al. (2017)
	Island occurrences	Global Ant Biodiversity Index - Islands (GABI-I)	Liu et al. (2023)
	Traits: list of ant species that visit EFNs	Published study	Kaur et al. (2019)
	Traits: list of ant species that interact with EFNs	Published study	Novais et al. (2025)

Table 2. Estimates and standard errors (s.e.) from phylogenetic logistic regression models for A) plants (N = 1517 species with complete trait data) and B) ants (N=1660 species with trait data). Island species presence/absence was modelled as a function of EFN status only for ants, or EFN status, mycorrhizal association, nitrogen-fixing symbionts, biotic pollination, woodiness, and lifecycle for plants. Alpha is a measure of phylogenetic signal. In A), the intercept represents abiotically pollinated, annual, herbaceous plants with no EFNs, no mycorrhizae, and no nitrogen-fixing symbionts. In B) the intercept represents ants that do not visit EFNs.

	Estimate	s.e.
A - Plants		
Intercept	0.79	0.42
EFN	*0.91****	*0.20*
Arbuscular mycorrhizal	*0.68**	*0.29*
Ectomycorrhizal	0.32	0.38
Orchid mycorrhizal	1.18	1.45
Nitrogen fixer	0.19	0.23
Biotic pollination	*-1.19****	*0.24*
Variable woodiness	-13.07	840.39
Woody	*-0.96****	*0.19*
Biennial	-1.06	1.06
Perennial	*-0.69**	*0.30*
Variable lifecycle	-13.64	793.66
Mean tip height	137.69	
Alpha	0.046	

B - Ants		
Intercept	*0.664****	*0.078*
EFN status	*1.070****	*0.189*
Mean tip height	136.99	
Alpha	0.055	

708 Significant effects are *italicized* and indicated by *** for $p \leq 0.001$, ** for $p \leq 0.01$ and *
709 for $p \leq 0.05$.

Table 3. Estimates and standard errors (s.e.) from Gaussian generalized linear models of the log response ratio of island to mainland species richness for A) plants (N = 169 groups) and B) ants (N = 178 groups) as a function of EFN mutualism status and biogeographical variables. Only island species that occur in at least one of the five likely source mainlands per island were included. Parameters ending in .i are island, .ml are mainland. Here, a positive estimate means a reduction of the island species deficit, whereas a negative estimate means a strengthening of the deficit.

	Estimate	s.e.
A - Plants		
Intercept	*-1.64****	*0.05*
Absolute latitude.i	*0.005**	*0.002*
EFN?	*0.44****	*0.07*
Distance.ml	*-0.23****	*0.03*
Area.i	*0.22****	*0.03*
Area.ml	*0.17****	*0.05*
Elevational range.i	0.004	0.03
Elevational range.ml	0.05	0.03
Annual precip.i	*0.19****	*0.03*
Latitude * EFN	-0.004	0.003
B - Ants		
Intercept	*-2.032****	*0.086*
Absolute latitude.i	0.004	0.003
EFN?	*0.829****	*0.092*

Distance.ml	*-0.072**	*0.035*
Area.i	*0.091***	*0.026*
Area.ml	-0.038	0.051
Annual precip.i	-0.046	0.034
Latitude * EFN	*-0.008**	*0.003*

717 Significant effects are *italicized* and indicated by *** for $p \leq 0.001$, ** for $p \leq 0.01$ and *
718 for $p \leq 0.05$.