Complex landscapes partially mitigate negative pesticide effects on tropical pollinator communities

Diana Obregon^a, Olger R. Guerrero^b, Elena Stashenko^c, Katja Poveda^d

a. Department of Entomology, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York 14853, United States, do265@cornell.edu, corresponding author.

b. Department of Agronomic Engineering, La Salle University, Yopal, Casanare 850008, Colombia, oguerrero56@unisalle.edu.co.

c. CROM-MASS Laboratory. Industrial University of Santander, Bucaramanga 680002, Colombia, hstashen@uis.edu.co.

d. Department of Entomology, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York 14853, United States, kap235@cornell.edu.

Highlights

- We explored how landscape composition and pesticide residues impact bee communities and pollination services in *Solanum quitoense* crops.
- As the proportion of natural habitat in the landscape increased, bee richness also increased. While as pesticide hazard quotients in *S. quitoense* anthers increased, bee diversity and abundance decreased.
- The natural habitat surrounding farms mitigates the negative pesticide effects on bees when hazard quotients are low/medium, but not when they are high.
- *S. quitoense* crops are highly dependent on bees for optimum yield.

24

25 **Abstract**

26 Land-use change and pesticides have been identified as two of the main causes behind
 27 pollinator decline. Understanding how these factors affect crop pollinator communities is
 28 crucial to inform practices that generate optimal pollination and ensure sustainable food
 29 production. In this study, we investigated the effects of landscape composition and pesticide
 30 residues on bee communities and their pollination services in *Solanum quitoense* “lulo” crops
 31 in Colombia. On 10 farms, located along a gradient of landscape complexity that varied from
 32 0.15 to 0.62 in their natural habitat proportion, we characterized the bee community visiting
 33 the crop, and carried out pollination experiments with bagged and open inflorescences to
 34 later estimate fruit set, weight, and diameter at every site. Additionally, we performed
 35 pesticide analysis on collected anthers through liquid chromatography to estimate pesticide
 36 risk coming from the crop fields using hazard quotients (HQ). Bee abundance and species
 37 richness decreased with increased HQ, but these negative pesticide effects were less
 38 detrimental in farms with higher natural habitat proportions. However, this buffer effect was
 39 lost at sites with very high HQs. Imidacloprid was frequently found in the anthers and there
 40 were extremely high concentrations in some farms (0.6 to 13063 µg/kg), representing the
 41 molecule of greater risk for bees in this context. Pollinator’s importance to crop yield was
 42 demonstrated in the exclusion experiments, where we found a reduction in fruit set (51%),
 43 weight (39%), and diameter (25%). We found a significant effect of bee richness on fruit set,
 44 while landscape composition and HQ had no significant effect on fruit set, suggesting that
 45 the last two factors do not affect yield directly, but indirectly through a decrease in pollinator
 46 diversity. Our results provide novel evidence that the natural habitat loss due to the expansion

of pastures for cattle ranching and pesticide residues in anthers reduce bee diversity and abundance in this Andean cropping system, but strategies to protect and restore natural habitat can help to buffer, until certain levels, these negative effects.

Keywords: Bee pollination, ecosystem services, imidacloprid, landscape simplification, lulo, *Solanum quitoense*.

1. Introduction

Crop pollination is a fundamental ecosystem service that provides significant benefits to about 75% of the leading global crops (Klein et al., 2007). Vegetables, fruits, nuts, and edible oil crops are among the most pollinator-dependent crops (Gallai et al., 2009). Insect pollination can increase fruit and seed set but also quality variables such as weight, symmetry, and nutritional value (Bartomeus et al., 2014; Bommarco et al., 2012; Garratt et al., 2014). Although there is a great number of insect taxa contributing to crop pollination (Rader et al., 2016), bee abundance and diversity are key to achieve optimum yields (Garibaldi et al., 2016; Winfree et al., 2018).

There is evidence that bee populations are declining (Bartomeus et al., 2013; Cameron et al., 2011; Mathiasson and Rehan, 2019). Land-use change, limited foraging resources, bee pathogens, pesticides, and the interaction among these factors have been identified as the main potential causes (Goulson et al., 2015). At the landscape scale, increases in cultivated areas are associated with natural habitat reduction and fragmentation (Petit and Firbank,

2006), leading to less floral and nesting resources for bees (Heard et al., 2007; Potts et al., 2005) and to lower bee abundance and diversity, with negative impacts on crop pollination services (Bommarco et al., 2013; Connelly et al., 2015; Kremen et al., 2002; Le Féon et al., 2010).

In agricultural settings, bees are frequently exposed to pesticides through direct contact while foraging or digging into the soil, or through the consumption of nectar, pollen, and water with pesticide residues (Krupke et al., 2012; Stoner and Eitzer, 2012). For example, neonicotinoids, are systemic insecticides commonly used in agriculture as foliar sprays, soil drench, or seed dressings to control a wide range of pests (Goulson, 2013). These insecticides, such as imidacloprid, are highly toxic for bees, and represent an important threat to pollinator communities due to their frequent application (Sanchez-Bayo and Goka, 2014). In laboratory conditions, it is widely demonstrated that neonicotinoids have lethal and sublethal effects on bees, such as associative learning reduction, a decrease in foraging activity (Blacquière et al., 2012) and a reduced immunocompetence (Aufauvre et al., 2012; Brandt et al., 2016). While in the field, some studies have shown negative effects of neonicotinoids on bees such as reduced colony growth in bumble bees (Goulson, 2015) or a reduced wild bee density and solitary bee nesting (Rundlöf et al., 2015), others have not found any effects (Pilling et al., 2013, Cutler et al., 2014). These inconclusive results indicate that more field experiments are needed to understand how realistic pesticide exposure affects pollinator communities in different contexts (Lundin et al., 2015).

Although the effects of landscape simplification and pesticides on bees are relatively well established, the interaction of these two stressors has not been significantly explored. In apple orchards in New York, it was shown that the use of pesticides is negatively correlated with bee richness, but this effect was weakened on farms with more natural habitat in the landscape (Park et al., 2015). In India, a study looking at bee diversity found that both semi-natural habitat areas, as well as pesticide use, regulate species diversity at the landscape scale (Basu et al., 2016). However, those studies are based on pesticide use reported by farmers and actual pesticide residues in the field were unknown.

Most of the work investigating the drivers that cause pollinator decline has been conducted in Europe and the US and it is mostly focused on honeybees and bumblebees (Lundin et al., 2015). For tropical regions, where the agricultural landscape is very heterogeneous and comprised of small landholdings and greater crop diversity, the information is limited (Brosi et al., 2007, 2008), making it difficult to develop strategies for conservation and restoration (Winfree et al., 2008). A case in point are the Andean mountains, which are experiencing a rapid loss of natural habitats due to their transformation into cropland and grazing areas (Etter et al., 2006; Foley et al., 2005). Pastures are now the main landcover type in the Andes, representing 65.2% of the total area and the biggest driver of forest losses (Rodríguez Eraso et al., 2013). The tendency to increase pesticide use in developing countries without the regulation of harmful molecules and consideration for effects on biodiversity is troubling (Lundin et al., 2015; Schreinemachers and Tipraqsa, 2012). So far, in this region, there is little information that shows the effects of this accelerated land transformation or pesticide use on the local wild bee populations or their effects on pollination services. Therefore, this

study aimed to establish how both landscape composition and pesticide residues affect the bee community and the pollination services in a traditional Andean crop (*Solanum quitoense* “Lulo”). Specifically, we were interested in testing if natural areas can actually buffer against the negative effects of pesticide exposure on bees in these Andean systems. To accomplish this goal, we characterized the flower visitors and the crop pollinator dependency along a landscape simplification gradient. We also screened for pesticide residues in lulo flower anthers to estimate the risk that this crop represents for the pollinator community.

2. Methods

2.1 Study system

Solanum quitoense (Solanaceae), known as “lulo” or “naranjilla”, is an Andean fruit used in Colombia and Ecuador for fresh consumption and by the juice industry (Sánchez Fory et al., 2010). Lulo plants are self-compatible, and strongly andromonoecious, producing both hermaphroditic and staminate flowers in the same inflorescences. Hermaphrodite flowers are distinctive by their long styles that exceed the anthers (Miller and Diggle, 2003). *Solanum* flowers produce no nectar and rely on the production of abundant protein-rich pollen to reward pollinators (Buchmann, 1986). Anthers are poricidal and require sonication to release the pollen (Buchmann and Cane, 1989). Palynological identification of pollen provisions have shown that lulo pollen is collected by *Bombus pullatus*, *Bombus atratus* (Mercado et al., 2017), and *Euglossa nigropilosa* (Otero et al., 2014). Greenhouse experiments demonstrated the efficient use of commercial colonies of *Bombus atratus* (Almanza, 2007), and *Bombus terrestris* (Messinger et al., 2016) as pollinators but there is no information on the wild pollinator community.

138

139 *2.2 Study region and landscape composition*

140 This study was conducted in 2018 in the municipality of Chameza (Casanare) on the eastern
141 slope of the eastern Andean Cordillera in Colombia. The study area is dominated by forested
142 mountains with steep slopes (Quintana et al., 2017), with all our sites located in elevations
143 between 1188 and 1683 m. Current land covers in the area are primary and secondary forest
144 (called natural habitat in this paper), pastures (grazing lands composed mostly of species of
145 the families Poaceae and Cyperaceae), and small-scale agricultural areas (mostly lulo and
146 sugarcane). In July of 2018, we selected 10 farms with conventional lulo production. Farms
147 were separated by a minimum distance of 1.4 km up to 15 km, and the areas planted with
148 lulo varied from 1200 to 7100m². Using a DJI Phantom 4 drone, and the Map Pilot
149 application, we acquired high-resolution images (5cm/pixel) at 500 m around the center of
150 every lulo crop. The images per site were combined in orthophotos in which polygons of the
151 different land cover types (natural habitat, pastures, and agriculture at the 500 m radius) were
152 manually drawn to calculate the area, and the different land covers' proportion using QGIS
153 2.18 Las Palmas (2016). Among the land cover types, the proportion of natural habitat and
154 the proportion pasture were highly correlated (*Pearson's* $r = -0.97$, $p < 0.001$, $n = 10$), and
155 together made up the majority of the area on each farm (87% to 99%). Based on this close
156 correlation, we used natural habitat as the landscape explanatory variable. The natural habitat
157 proportion among farms ranged from 0.15 to 0.62, forming a landscape gradient from simple
158 to complex landscapes respectively (Supplementary Figure S1 and Table S2).

159

160 *2.3 Pesticide Analysis*

161 We collected all the anthers of one flower from 10 different plants at every farm to assess the
 162 pesticide exposure risk of bees in the crop. The pesticide analysis was performed in the
 163 Laboratory of chromatography and mass spectrometry CROM-MASS at the Industrial
 164 University of Santander. Samples were tested for the nine most commonly used pesticides in
 165 the crop (Insecticides: Methomyl, Abamectin, Bifenthrin, Imidacloprid, Profenofos,
 166 Lufenuron, and Fungicides: Cymoxanil, Difenconazole, Propamocarb). The extractions
 167 were made following the QuEChERS protocol (Thermo Scientific, short protocol:
 168 AB21891). The extractions were analyzed with ultra-high efficiency liquid chromatography
 169 (UHPLC) *Dionex Ultimate 3000* (Thermo Scientific), equipped with a binary gradient bomb
 170 (HP G3400RS), an automatic sample (WPS 300TRS), and a thermostet unit for the column
 171 (TCC 3000). The LC-MS interface was an electro-nebulization (ESI) and a high-resolution
 172 mass spectrometer with an *Orbitrap* detection system of ions. The chromatographic
 173 separation was made with the column *Hypersil GOLD Aq* (Thermo Scientific, 100x2.1 mm,
 174 1.9 μ m particle size) at 30°C. The mobile phase was A: Aqueous solution 0.2% ammonium
 175 formate, and B: acetonitrile with 0.2% ammonium formate. The initial condition of the
 176 gradient was 100% A, changing linearly until 100% B (8min). It remained 4 min, with a
 177 return to the initial condition in 1 min. The run total time was 13 min, with 3 min of post-
 178 run. The mass spectrometer Orbitrap (Exactive Plus, Thermo Scientific) was connected to
 179 the electronebulization interface (HESI), operated in positive mode with a capillary voltage
 180 of 4.5 kV. Nitrogen was used as drying gas. The mass spectrum was acquired in the mass
 181 range 60-900 m/z. The mass detector Orbitrap was calibrated with the certified reference
 182 solutions: UltramarkTM 1621 Mass Spec. (AB172435, ABCR GmbH & Co. KG), sodium
 183 dodecyl sulfate (L45509, Sigma-Aldrich), and sodium taurocholate hydrated (T4009, Sigma-

Aldrich). Compound identification was made using the acquisition mode *Full scan* and the ions extraction corresponding to the pesticides tested $[M+H]^+$, mass measuring with accuracy and precision of $\Delta_{ppm} < 0.001$, and using a mix standard solution of the pesticides.

For the pesticides detected, we calculated the Hazard Quotient (HQ) as an estimation of the pesticide risk based on the residue concentrations found in the anthers over the LD50 for every molecule ($HQ = \text{Concentration of the pesticide residue in the anthers} / \text{acute oral LD50}$ for honey bees, modified from Stoner and Eitzer, 2013). No estimate of pollen consumption was included in this calculation since bees found in the crop are mostly generalists and do not rely on just lulo pollen. Hazard quotients for every pesticide in each farm were summed to estimate a total HQ per farm (Supplementary Table S3). To estimate the contribution of every pesticide to a total hazard in this agroecosystem we calculated an HQ per molecule based on the mean concentration found in the anthers across farms (Table 3).

2.4 Bee diversity and flower visitation

To characterize the diversity of the pollinator community in lulo crops, during the dry season, when most of the blooming occurred, we sampled the flower visitors on every farm three times in September, October, and November. Two observers walked for 30 minutes during warm and sunny days from 9:00 to 16:00h, collecting and counting the number of bees observed visiting the flowers. Collected specimens were identified to the lowest level possible depending on the availability of entomological keys and reference material for the country in the bee collection of the Bee Research laboratory (LABUN) at the National

University of Colombia in Bogota. We calculated species richness (number of bee species) and abundance (number of bee visits) at every farm.

2.5 Pollination experiments and yield

We selected 20 lulo plants in a transect throughout the field to estimate the pollinators' contribution to fruit production at each farm during the first two weeks of September. Plants were at least 6m apart from each other. For every plant, we chose a pair of closed inflorescences with similar size but in different branches (30cm to 50 cm apart). We bagged one inflorescence using fine organza bags (13x18cm) and left the other open to be visited by the naturally occurring flower visitors. We counted the number of hermaphrodite and staminate flowers to later calculate the fruit set as the number of developed fruits over the number of hermaphrodite flowers. Two weeks later, after all petals had fallen off the flowers, we removed the bags and counted the number of fruits. Three and a half months later, when most of the fruits reached the commercial harvest point, we weighed the fruits and measured the fruit diameter.

2.6 Statistical analysis

All the analyses were conducted in R version 3.3.0 (R Core Team, 2019). We examined the effects of landscape composition, pesticide residue, and their interaction on bee diversity and abundance using generalized linear mixed-effects models (GLMM) (Bates et al., 2015) with farm as a random effect to account for nonindependence of samples taken from the same site. However, the variance contributed by farm was very close to zero making the inclusion of the random effect unnecessary (Bolker et al., 2009). We then built models with generalized

linear models (GLM) with Poisson error distribution and log link for richness, and quasipoisson and log link for abundance to adjust for overdispersion. To test for spatial autocorrelation of the residuals, we used the Moran's I test with the function *testSpatialAutocorrelation* from the R package *DHARMA* (Hartig, 2020), and found no autocorrelation for either variable (Richness: $p = 0.085$, Abundance: $p = 0.56$). We also evaluated the effects of richness, abundance, bagged and open treatments, landscape composition, and pesticide residue on fruit set using a GLM with quasibinomial error distribution and logit link function. Quasibinomial error was used to correct for underdispersion. We then obtained the best average model with the *dredge* and *model.avg* functions of the MuMIn package based on $\Delta 2$ Quasi Akaike Information Criterion (Barton, 2019). To assess the statistical significance of each explanatory variable and interaction terms of the final models we used Chi-square test for the Poisson fitted model and conditional F tests for the quasipoisson and quasibinomial fitted models with the function *anova.glm* of the stats package (R Core Team, 2019). We used paired t-tests to compare average fruit sets, fruit weights, and fruit diameters among pollination treatments (open and bagged flowers) to determine the contribution of pollinators to lulo yield across farms.

3. Results

3.1 Lulo crop pollinator community

In this study, we registered 650 bee visits to lulo flowers from 16 bee species. The most common flower visitor was *Tetragonisca angustula* (33.7%, n=216) followed by *Melipona gr. fasciata* (18.9%, n=121), *Paratrigona opaca* (17.7%, n=113) and *Apis mellifera* (11.6%,

n=74; Table 1). Bee richness per farm ranged from 1 up to 12 bee species visiting the flowers during the three samplings.

Table 1. List of bee species visiting *Solanum quitoense* crops in Casanare, Colombia. The list is organized from the most common visitor presented at the top, to the least common visitor presented at the bottom. ‘n’ represents the total number of visits observed over three samplings dates, each sampling was 30 minutes long with two observers, and ‘%’ the percentage of visits from that one species in relation to the total number of visits observed.

Tribe	Species	n	%
Meliponini	<i>Tetragonisca angustula</i>	216	33.75
Meliponini	<i>Melipona gr. fasciata</i>	121	18.91
Meliponini	<i>Paratrigona opaca</i>	113	17.66
Apini	<i>Apis mellifera</i>	74	11.56
Bombini	<i>Bombus transversalis</i>	31	4.84
Euglossini	<i>Euglossa sp. (Females)</i>	21	3.28
Euglossini	<i>Eulaema cingulata</i>	14	2.19
Euglossini	<i>Eulaema mocsaryi</i>	14	2.19
Augochlorini	<i>Augochloropsis sp. 1</i>	9	1.41
Augochlorini	<i>Augochlora sp.1</i>	8	1.25
Bombini	<i>Bombus excellens</i>	8	1.25
Meliponini	<i>Trigona fulviventris var guianae</i>	7	1.09
Meliponini	<i>Plebeia sp.1</i>	1	0.16
Meliponini	<i>Scaptotrigona sp.1</i>	1	0.16

Eucerini	<i>Thygater aethiops</i>	1	0.16
Eucerini	<i>Thygater analis</i>	1	0.16

3.2 Pesticide results

For the pesticide detections, we found 5 out of the 9 molecules tested in the anthers. The two most frequent pesticides found were the fungicide Propamocarb in 100% of the farms, ranging from 1.3 to 399.5 µg/kg, and the insecticide imidacloprid in 80% of the farms ranging from 0.6 to 13063 µg/kg. The contribution of every pesticide to the total HQ shows that imidacloprid contributes 99.34% to the total hazard being the main molecule generating a risk to pollinators in this cropping system (Table 2).

Table 2. Hazard quotients (HQ) calculated for the pesticides detected in anthers of *S. quitoense* crops in Casanare, Colombia, and the contribution to a Total hazard quotient for the cropping system in the region.

Pesticide	Frequency of detection (%)	Mean (µg /kg)	Oral LD50 (µg/bee)*	Mean HQ oral	Contribution to Total HQ (%)
Insecticides					
Imidacloprid ^a	80	1391.14	0.0039	356702.6	99.34
Methomyl ^b	30	2.89	0.24	12	0
Abamectin ^c	20	21.31	0.009	2367.8	0.66
Fungicides					
Difenoconazole ^a	50	26.29	178	0.1	0
Propamocarb ^f	100	53.26	84	0.6	0
Σ HQ				359083.2	

*Source of Oral LD50:

a. ECOTOX, 2019

b. Clinch, 1981; c. Wislocki *et al.*, 1989; d. Ellis *et al.*, 1997; e. Winter., 1990; f. PPDB

(University of Hertfordshire); g. EFSA Scientific Report (2008).

3.3 Landscape and pesticide effects on bee richness

Overall, as the proportion of natural habitat increased bee richness increased ($X^2_{(1,28)} = 6.9$, $p\text{-value} = 0.0086$, Fig.1a), and as the HQ per farm increased bee richness decreased ($X^2_{(1,27)} = 11.06$, $p\text{-value} < 0.001$, Fig.1b). Further, these two factors were interacting ($X^2_{(1,26)} = 5.54$, $p\text{-value} = 0.0186$, Fig.2a). The negative effect of an increased HQ on bee richness was less detrimental in farms with higher proportions of natural habitat. For example, for farms No. 1 and No. 5 with similar HQ levels (828,5 and 743,7 respectively; Supplementary Table S3) the richness in farm No.5 (10 species) was twice as large as in farm No.1 (5 species), and this difference can be explained by the higher proportion in natural habitat in farm No.5 (Farm 1: 29,4%, Farm 5: 62,3%). But this buffer effect is lost in farms where the HQs are very high ($>10,000$; Fig. 2a).

3.4 Landscape and pesticide effects on bee abundance

We found no significant effect of natural habitat proportion on bee abundance ($F_{(1,28)} = 0.7625$, $p\text{-value} = 0.390$, Fig.1c), while as HQ per farm increased bee abundance decreased ($F_{(1,27)} = 8.4243$, $p\text{-value} = 0.007$, Fig.1d). However, there was a significant interaction effect ($F_{(1,26)} = 8.80$, $p\text{-value} = 0.0063$, Fig.2b), where a higher proportion of natural habitat attenuates the negative effects of pesticides on bee abundance, but once again this effect is lost in farms where HQs are above 10,000 (Fig. 2b).

Figure 1. (a-b) Bee richness and **(c-d)** abundance in relation to the proportion of natural habitat at 500m around the *S. quiotense* crops, and the hazard quotient (HQ) calculated for the pesticide residues found in the anthers (x axis for HQ is log-transformed). Lines represent a significant regression between the two factors ($p < 0.005$) and the grey areas are the standard errors.

Figure 2. (a) Bee richness and **(b)** bee abundance in relation to the Hazard Quotient (HQ) calculated per farm (x axis log-transformed) for two different levels of the proportion of natural habitat at 500m in *S. quiotense* crops (Dark green: above mean, light green: below mean, mean=0.33). Natural habitat categories were only used for graphical purposes to depict the interaction effect, but they were not used in the regression model analysis.

3.5 Yield

We found a mean number of 11 (+/-2.2) flowers per inflorescence, 71% staminate, and 29% hermaphrodite flowers. For all the fruit yield variables, the open pollination treatment had a

higher yield than the bagged treatment. The mean fruit set was 4% for the bagged treatment (bagged inflorescences), and 61% for open-pollinated treatment ($t = -7.982$, $df = 9.5087$, p -value <0.001 , Fig.3a). The mean fruit weight was 61.8 g for bagged flowers and 86.2 g for open pollination ($t = 13.814$, $df = 23.117$, p -value <0.001 , Fig. 3b). Fruit diameter also differed among treatments: the mean for the bagged treatment was 4.37cm and 5.49 cm for open pollination ($t = 8.8456$, $df = 21.324$, p -value <0.001 , Fig. 3c).

Figure 3. Average fruit set (a), fruit weight (b), and fruit diameter (c) (± 1 SE) of bagged and open pollinated *S. quitoense* fruits across farms. (*) denotes significant differences among treatments.

The best supported model for fruit set (fruit set $\sim$ open/bagged treatment + richness + HQ + Natural habitat) showed that bee richness ($F_{(1,367)}=4.97$, p -value $=0.0262$, Fig.4) and open/bagged treatments had significant effects on fruit set ($F_{(1,370)}= 292.5$, p -value $=<0.001$). While HQ had a weak effect ($F_{(1,368)}= 2.928$, p -value $=0.087$) and the proportion of natural habitat was not significant ($F_{(1,369)}= 0.0087$, p -value $=0.925$).

Figure 4. Fruit set in relation to bee richness in *S. quitoense* crops. Line represents a significant regression between the two factors ($p < 0.005$) and the grey area the standard error.

4. Discussion

We assessed the landscape composition and pesticide residue effects on bee diversity, abundance, and pollination services in *S. quitoense*. Our results provide evidence that the natural habitat loss due to the expansion of pastures for cattle ranching reduces bee diversity in this tropical cropping system. This may occur because the pollinator community requires floral and nesting resources that are more abundant in natural habitats than grasslands. In tropical forests, it has been shown that bee community composition changes with forest fragmentation and traits like tree-cavity nesting in Meliponini bees or loss of particular plant groups (*i.e.* epiphytes for Euglossini) are determinant in those changes (Allen et al., 2019; Brosi et al., 2007). We found a significant decline in richness but not in abundance, suggesting that in farms with less natural habitat in the landscape, vulnerable species are

being lost but common species could be taking advantage of these resources provided by the crop.

From the five pesticides detected, the fungicide propamocarb and the insecticide imidacloprid were the most prevalent. It should be noted that both products are systemic, which means that although they are applied to the soil or foliage in this crop, they can reach the floral organs, as shown by our results. Propamocarb is considered low to moderately toxic to honey bees (EFSA, 2006), and in this study, we did not find any impact on the bee community. However, studies on sub-lethal effects and long-term effects are required. In contrast, imidacloprid is a highly toxic molecule for bees (EFSA, 2012), and the concentrations found were extremely high, far above any other concentration previously reported in flowers for any crop (Blacquire et al., 2012). In the region, farmers attribute the excessive use of insecticides to the control of a fruit borer moth (*Neoleucinodes elegantalis*), which oviposits on newly formed fruits. Complementary studies must consider the level of this pest in different farms which can explain the high quantity of pesticides found. Additionally, it has been described that smallholder growers in Colombia tend to over- or mis-use use pesticides in solanaceous crops (Bojac et al., 2013; Feola and Binder, 2010).

In this field study, we show that bee richness and bee diversity decreased as the anther HQ per farm increased. Additionally, based on the toxicity and the frequency of the pesticides found in the samples, imidacloprid is the pesticide that represents the greatest risk for bees, as has been shown in studies for other regions of the world (Sanchez-Bayo and Goka, 2014). The same negative effect has been demonstrated in apple orchards in Wisconsin, where

369 abundance and richness of *Lasioglossum* species decreased with the increased use of
 370 imidacloprid (Mallinger et al., 2015). Our approach of testing the actual residuality in the
 371 anthers provides a field-realistic estimation of the pesticide exposure generated by this crop,
 372 given that *S. quitoense* does not produce any nectar. However, while the HQ based on LD50s
 373 for honey bees could predict effects on the whole pollinator community, specific effects must
 374 be studied since it has been demonstrated that different bee species vary in their susceptibility
 375 to pesticides. Bumble bees and stingless bees in particular, have shown greater susceptibility
 376 to certain pesticides compared to honey bees (Cresswell et al., 2014; Del Sarto et al., 2005).

377
 378 Our results provide new evidence about the interactive effects between landscape
 379 composition and pesticide exposure, showing that natural habitat area surrounding crops can
 380 help to mitigate negative pesticide effects on bee communities. However, this buffer effect
 381 is present until certain levels of HQ, showing that very high concentrations of pesticides are
 382 deleterious in any landscape. This might be explained by the fact that most of the bees visiting
 383 this crop are generalists, and depending on their diet, the pesticide toxicity can be diluted. A
 384 model created for honey bees foraging in landscapes with oilseed rape showed that a
 385 significant pesticide dilution can occur when alternative resource patches are equal or more
 386 attractive than the focal crop and these are close and abundant (Baveco et al., 2016).

387
 388 We found 16 bee species from 6 tribes visiting lulo flowers. *Tetragonisca angustula* and
 389 *Paratrigona opaca* were two of the most frequent visitors, and although they do not perform
 390 sonication, they were observed removing pollen through the anther pores using their glossa
 391 and hind legs. How efficient they are at transporting pollen to the stigma is still in question.

On the other hand, we observed 10 species sonicating the flowers, among them *M. gr. fasciata* was the most abundant. Other species of the genus *Melipona* have been previously reported as efficient pollinators of Solanaceous crops such as tomato and eggplant (Bartelli and Nogueira-Ferreira, 2014; Nunes-Silva et al., 2013). A study assessing the effects of imidacloprid consumption in bumble bees pollinating tomatoes showed that imidacloprid affected the probability of performing sonication behavior in flowers (Switzer and Combes, 2016). This might suggest that pesticides in lulo are not just affecting bee diversity but also their capacity to release the pollen during visitation.

We found a 51% reduction in fruit set when flower visitors were excluded, showing a high pollinator dependency according to the Klein *et al.* (2007) classification (40 to 90% reduction: high dependency). We also found a 39% decrease in fruit weight and 25% in fruit diameter without bees demonstrating their contributions to crop yield. These results are similar to those found on artificial cross-pollination treatments in greenhouses for lulo (Almanza, 2007; Messinger et al., 2016). We did not find significant effects of landscape composition, or pesticides on fruit set while bee richness was significant. This suggest that these factors do not affect the yield directly, but through the decrease of the pollinators.

The results of this study can help farmers, land planners, and local institutions to make decisions towards pollinators protection measures before the reduction of bees is exacerbated, leading to more pronounced effects on crop productivity. This study supports the protection of natural areas surrounding crops as a strategy to promote crop pollinator communities. Based on the wide variation and the high amounts of imidacloprid found, it is

also necessary to understand the factors that are driving these applications in crops and develop strategies to reduce them. In addition, restoration and the implementation of local diversification strategies might be established to aid bees to overcome the risks associated with pesticides.

Acknowledgments

A special thank you to the participating growers who provided the field sites for this study. Thanks to David Sossa for invaluable field assistance. Also thank you to Rodulfo Ospina, Diego Guevara, Jorge Diaz, and Joanna Jaramillo for bee identifications. We are grateful to Scott McArt, Bryan Danforth, Beatriz Ramirez, and Fiona Rodgerson for helpful revisions to earlier versions of the manuscript. D.O. was funded by Fulbright - COLCIENCIAS (Colombian Administrative Department of Science, Technology, and Innovation) through a doctorate scholarship. Fieldwork for this study was funded by the Richard Bradfield Research Award and the Grace H. Griswold Fund, both from the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences at Cornell University.

Conflict of interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

Allen, L., Reeve, R., Nousek-McGregor, A., Villacampa, J., MacLeod, R., 2019. Are orchid bees useful indicators of the impacts of human disturbance? *Ecol. Indic.* 103, 745-755. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2019.02.046>.

- 438 Almanza Fandino, M.T.A., 2007. Management of *Bombus atratus* bumblebees to pollinate
439 Lulo (*Solanum quitoense* L), a native fruit from the Andes of Colombia. In: Denish
440 M., Martius, C., Rodgers, C., Giesen, N. (Eds.). Ecology and Development Series. No.
441 50. Göttingen, pp. 1-106.
- 442 Aufauvre, J., Biron, D.G., Vidau, C., Fontbonne, R., Roudel, M., Diogon, M., Viguès, B.,
443 Belzunces, L.P., Delbac, F., Blot, N., 2012. Parasite-insecticide interactions: a case
444 study of *Nosema ceranae* and fipronil synergy on honeybee. Sci. Rep. 2, 326.
445 <https://doi.org/10.1038/srep00326>.
- 446 Bartelli, B.F., Nogueira-Ferreira, F.H., 2014. Pollination services provided by *Melipona*
447 *quadrifasciata* Lepeletier (Hymenoptera: Meliponini) in greenhouses with *Solanum*
448 *lycopersicum* L. (Solanaceae). Sociobiology. 61(4), 510-516.
449 <https://doi.org/10.13102/sociobiology.v61i4.510-516>.
- 450 Bartomeus, I., Ascher, J.S., Gibbs, J., Danforth, B.N., Wagner, D.L., Hedtke, S.M.,
451 Winfree, R., 2013. Historical changes in northeastern US bee pollinators related to
452 shared ecological traits. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A. 110 (12) 4656-4660.
453 <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1218503110>.
- 454 Bartomeus, I., Potts, S.G., Steffan-Dewenter, I., Vaissière, B.E., Woyciechowski, M.,
455 Krewenka, K.M., Tscheulin, T., Roberts, S.P.M., Szentgyörgyi, H., Westphal, C.,
456 Bommarco, R., 2014. Contribution of insect pollinators to crop yield and quality
457 varies with agricultural intensification. PeerJ 2, e328.
458 <https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.328>.
- 459 Bartoń, K. 2019. MuMIn: Multi-Model Inference. R package version 1.43.15.
460 <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=MuumIn>

- 461 Basu, P., Parui, A.K., Chatterjee, S., Dutta, A., Chakraborty, P., Roberts, S., Smith, B.,
462 2016. Scale-dependent drivers of wild bee diversity in tropical heterogeneous
463 agricultural landscapes. *Ecol. Evol.* 6 (19), 6983-6992.
464 <https://doi.org/10.1002/ece3.2360>
- 465 Baveco, J.M., Focks, A., Belgers, D., van der Steen, J.J.M., Boesten, J.J.T.I., Roessink, I.,
466 2016. An energetics-based honeybee nectar-foraging model used to assess the
467 potential for landscape-level pesticide exposure dilution. *PeerJ.* 4: e2293.
468 <https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.2293>.
- 469 Blacquire, T., Smagghe, G., Van Gestel, C.A.M., Mommaerts, V., 2012. Neonicotinoids
470 in bees: A review on concentrations, side-effects and risk assessment. *Ecotoxicology*
471 21, 973–992. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10646-012-0863-x>.
- 472 Bojac, C.R., Arias, L.A., Ahumada, D.A., Casilimas, H.A., Schrevers, E., 2013.
473 Evaluation of pesticide residues in open field and greenhouse tomatoes from
474 Colombia. *Food Control.* 30(2), 400-403.
475 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodcont.2012.08.015>.
- 476 Bolker, B.M., Brooks, M.E., Clark, C., Geange, S. W., Poulsen, J.R., Stevens, M., White,
477 J.S. 2009. Generalized linear mixed models: a practical guide for ecology and
478 evolution. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, 24(3), 127-135.
479 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2008.10.008>.
- 480 Bommarco, R., Kleijn, D., Potts, S.G., 2013. Ecological intensification: Harnessing
481 ecosystem services for food security. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* 28, 230–238.
482 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2012.10.012>.
- 483 Bommarco, R., Marini, L., Vaissre, B.E., 2012. Insect pollination enhances seed yield,

484 quality, and market value in oilseed rape. *Oecologia* 169, 1025–1032.
 485 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00442-012-2271-6>.

486 Brandt, A., Gorenflo, A., Siede, R., Meixner, M., Büchler, R., 2016. The neonicotinoids
 487 thiacloprid, imidacloprid, and clothianidin affect the immunocompetence of honey
 488 bees (*Apis mellifera* L.). *J. Insect Physiol.* 86, 40–47.
 489 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jinsphys.2016.01.001>.

490 Brosi, B.J., Daily, G.C., Ehrlich, P.R., 2007. Bee community shifts with landscape context
 491 in a tropical countryside. *Ecol. Appl.* 17, 418–430. <https://doi.org/10.1890/06-0029>.

492 Brosi, B.J., Daily, G.C., Shih, T.M., Oviedo, F., Durán, G., 2008. The effects of forest
 493 fragmentation on bee communities in tropical countryside. *J. Appl. Ecol.* 45, 773–783.
 494 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2664.2007.01412.x>.

495 Buchmann, S., Cane, J., 1989. Bees assess pollen returns while sonicating *Solanum*
 496 flowers. *Oecologia*. 81(3), 289-294. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00377073>.

497 Buchmann, S.L., 1986. Vibratile pollination in *Solanum* and *Lycopersicon*: A look at pollen
 498 chemistry. In: D'Arcy, W. G. (Ed.). *Solanaceae: Biology and Systematics*. Columbia
 499 University Press, New York, pp 238-252.

500 Cameron, S.A., Lozier, J.D., Strange, J.P., Koch, J.B., Cordes, N., Solter, L.F., Griswold,
 501 T.L., 2011. Patterns of widespread decline in North American bumble bees. *Proc.*
 502 *Natl. Acad. Sci.* 108, 662–667. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1014743108>.

503 Clinch, P.G., 1981. Rapid methods for orally dosing adult honey bees, individually or in
 504 groups, without anesthetic. *New Zeal. J. Exp. Agric.* 9, 27-30.
 505 <https://doi.org/10.1080/03015521.1981.10427798>.

506 Connelly, H., Poveda, K., Loeb, G., 2015. Landscape simplification decreases wild bee

507 pollination services to strawberry. *Agric. Ecosyst. Environ.* 211, 51–56.

508 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2015.05.004>.

509 Cresswell, J.E., Robert, F.X.L., Florance, H., Smirnoff, N., 2014. Clearance of ingested

510 neonicotinoid pesticide (imidacloprid) in honey bees (*Apis mellifera*) and bumblebees

511 (*Bombus terrestris*). *Pest Manag. Sci.* 70(2), 332-7. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ps.3569>.

512 Cutler, G.C., Scott-Dupree, C.D., Sultan, M., McFarlane, A.D., Brewer, L. 2014. A large-

513 scale field study examining effects of exposure to clothianidin seed-treated canola on

514 honey bee colony health, development, and overwintering success. *PeerJ* 2:e652

515 <https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.652>

516 Del Sarto, M.C.L., Peruquetti, R.C., Campos, L.A.O., 2005. Evaluation of the neotropical

517 stingless bee *Melipona quadrifasciata* (Hymenoptera: Apidae) as pollinator of

518 greenhouse tomatoes. *J. Econ. Entomol.* 98, 260–266.

519 <https://doi.org/10.1093/jee/98.2.260>.

520 ECOTOX. 2019. Pesticide Ecotoxicity Database of the Office of Pesticide Programs,

521 Ecological Fate and Effects Division, of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.

522 <https://ecotox.ipmcenters.org/index.cfm?menuid=7> (Accessed 1 March 2019).

523 EFSA, 2006. Conclusion regarding the peer review of the pesticide risk assessment of the

524 active substance: propamocarb. *EFSA J.* 4(7) 78.

525 <https://doi.org/10.2903/j.efsa.2006.78r>.

526 EFSA, 2008. Conclusion regarding the peer review of the pesticide risk assessment

527 of the active substance cymoxanil. *EFSA J.* 167, 1-116.

528 <https://doi.org/10.2903/j.efsa.2008.167r>.

529 EFSA, 2012. Statement on the findings in recent studies investigating sub-lethal effects in

530 bees of some neonicotinoids in consideration of the uses currently authorized in
531 Europe. EFSA J. 10 (6), 2752. <https://doi.org/10.2903/j.efsa.2012.2752>.

532 Ellis, M.D., Siegfried, B.D., Spawn, B., 1997. The effect of Apistan® on honey bee (*Apis*
533 *mellifera* L). Responses to methyl parathion, carbaryl and bifenthrin exposure.
534 Apidologie. 28(3-4), 123-127. <https://doi.org/10.1051/apido:19970303>.

535 Etter, A., McAlpine, C., Wilson, K., Phinn, S., Possingham, H., 2006. Regional patterns of
536 agricultural land use and deforestation in Colombia. Agric. Ecosyst. Environ. 114,
537 369–386. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2005.11.013>.

538 Feola, G., Binder, C.R., 2010. Identifying and investigating pesticide application types to
539 promote a more sustainable pesticide use. The case of smallholders in Boyacá,
540 Colombia. Crop Prot. 29(6), 612-622. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cropro.2010.01.008>.

541 Foley, J.A., De Fries, R., Asner, G.P., Barford, C., Bonan, G., Carpenter, S.R., Chapin,
542 F.S., Coe, M.T., Daily, G.C., Gibbs, H.K., Helkowski, J.H., Holloway, T., Howard,
543 E.A., Kucharik, C.J., Monfreda, C., Patz, J.A., Prentice, I.C., Ramankutty, N., Snyder,
544 P.K., 2005. Global consequences of land use. Science. 309 (5734), 570-574.
545 <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1111772>.

546 Gallai, N., Salles, J.M., Settele, J., Vaissière, B.E., 2009. Economic valuation of the
547 vulnerability of world agriculture confronted with pollinator decline. Ecol. Econ. 68,
548 810–821. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2008.06.014>.

549 Garibaldi, L.A., Carvalheiro, L.G., Vaissière, B.E., Gemmill-Herren, B., Hipólito, J.,
550 Freitas, B.M., Ngo, H.T., Azzu, N., Sáez, A., Åström, J., An, J., Blochtein, B.,
551 Buchori, D., Chamorro García, F.J., Da Silva, F.O., Devkota, K., De Fátima Ribeiro,
552 M., Freitas, L., Gaglianone, M.C., Goss, M., Irshad, M., Kasina, M., Pacheco Filho,

553 A.J.S., Piedade Kiill, L.H., Kwapong, P., Parra, G.N., Pires, C., Pires, V., Rawal, R.S.,
554 Rizali, A., Saraiva, A.M., Veldtman, R., Viana, B.F., Witter, S., Zhang, H., 2016.
555 Mutually beneficial pollinator diversity and crop yield outcomes in small and large
556 farms. *Science*. 351 (6271), 388-391. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aac7287>.
557 Garratt, M.P.D., Breeze, T.D., Jenner, N., Polce, C., Biesmeijer, J.C., Potts, S.G., 2014.
558 Avoiding a bad apple: Insect pollination enhances fruit quality and economic value.
559 *Agric. Ecosyst. Environ.* 184, 34-40. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2013.10.032>.
560 Goulson, D., 2013. An overview of the environmental risks posed by neonicotinoid
561 insecticides. *J. Appl. Ecol.* 50(4), 977-987. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2664.12111>.
562 Goulson, D., 2015. Neonicotinoids impact bumblebee colony fitness in the field; a
563 reanalysis of the UK's food & environment research agency 2012 experiment. *PeerJ*.
564 3:e854. <https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.854>.
565 Goulson, D., Nicholls, E., Botías, C., Rotheray, E.L., 2015. Bee declines driven by
566 combined stress from parasites, pesticides, and lack of flowers. *Science*. 347(6229),
567 1255957. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1255957>.
568 Hartig, F., 2020. DHARMA: Residual Diagnostics for Hierarchical (Multi-Level / Mixed)
569 Regression Models. R package version 0.3.3.0. [https://CRAN.R-](https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=DHARMA)
570 [project.org/package=DHARMA](https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=DHARMA)
571 Heard, M.S., Carvell, C., Carreck, N.L., Rothery, P., Osborne, J.L., Bourke, A.F.G., 2007.
572 Landscape context not patch size determines bumble-bee density on flower mixtures
573 sown for agri-environment schemes. *Biol. Lett.* 3, 638–641.
574 <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsbl.2007.0425>.
575 Klein, A.M., Vaissière, B.E., Cane, J.H., Steffan-Dewenter, I., Cunningham, S.A., Kremen,

576 C., Tschardtke, T., 2007. Importance of pollinators in changing landscapes for world
577 crops. *Proc. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.* 274, 303–313.
578 <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2006.3721>.

579 Kremen, C., Williams, N.M., Thorp, R.W., 2002. Crop pollination from native bees at risk
580 from agricultural intensification. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* 99 (26), 16812-16816.
581 <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.262413599>.

582 Krupke, C.H., Hunt, G.J., Eitzer, B.D., Andino, G., Given, K., 2012. Multiple routes of
583 pesticide exposure for honey bees living near agricultural fields. *PLoS One.* 7(1),
584 e29268. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0029268>.

585 Le Féon, V., Schermann-Legionnet, A., Delettire, Y., Aviron, S., Billeter, R., Bugter, R.,
586 Hendrickx, F., Burel, F., 2010. Intensification of agriculture, landscape composition
587 and wild bee communities: A large scale study in four European countries. *Agric.*
588 *Ecosyst. Environ.* 137, 143–150. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2010.01.015>.

589 Lundin, O., Rundlöf, M., Smith, H.G., Fries, I., Bommarco, R., 2015. Neonicotinoid
590 insecticides and their impacts on bees: A systematic review of research approaches
591 and identification of knowledge gaps. 10(8), e0136928. *PLoS One.*
592 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0136928>.

593 Mallinger, R.E., Werts, P., Gratton, C., 2015. Pesticide use within a pollinator-dependent
594 crop has negative effects on the abundance and species richness of sweat bees,
595 *Lasioglossum* spp., and on bumble bee colony growth. *J. Insect Conserv.* 19, 999–
596 1010. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10841-015-9816-z>.

597 Mathiasson, M.E., Rehan, S.M., 2019. Status changes in the wild bees of north-eastern
598 North America over 125 years revealed through museum specimens. 12(4), 278-288.

599 Insect Conserv. Divers. <https://doi.org/10.1111/icad.12347>.

600 Mercado-G, J., Solano-R, C., Wolfgang R, H., 2017. Recursos florales usados por dos
601 especies de *Bombus* en un fragmento de bosque subandino (Pamplonita-Colombia).
602 Rev. Colomb. Cienc. Anim. RECIA. 9(1), 31-37.
603 <https://doi.org/10.24188/recia.v9.n1.2017.495>.

604 Messinger, J., Martini, M.M.F., Rossi, G., Samuels, J., Lauerer, M., 2016. Successful
605 pollination of the Neotropical crop *Solanum quitoense* by *Bombus terrestris*:
606 Behaviour, efficiency and yield. J. Appl. Entomol. 140(1-2), 124-134.
607 <https://doi.org/10.1111/jen.12237>.

608 Miller, J.S., Diggle, P.K., 2003. Diversification of andromonoecy in *Solanum* section
609 Lasiocarpa (Solanaceae): The roles of phenotypic plasticity and architecture. Am. J.
610 Bot. 90(5), 707-15. <https://doi.org/10.3732/ajb.90.5.707>.

611 Nunes-Silva, P., Hrnčir, M., Da Silva, C.I., Roldão, Y.S., Imperatriz-Fonseca, V.L., 2013.
612 Stingless bees, *Melipona fasciculata*, as efficient pollinators of eggplant (*Solanum*
613 *melongena*) in greenhouses. Apidologie. 44 (5), 537-546.
614 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13592-013-0204-y>.

615 Otero, J.T., Campuzano, A.M., Zuluaga, P.A., Caetano, C.M., 2014. Pollen carried by
616 *Euglossa nigropilosa* Moure (Apidae: Euglossinae) at la planada nature reserve,
617 Nariño, Colombia. Boletín del Mus. Entomol. la Univ. del Val. 15(1), 1.
618 <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/045c/5d6a808cd37a5c1535cb7a35475ec534eb01.pdf>.
619 (Accessed: 13 Nov 2019).

620 Park, M.G., Blitzer, E.J., Gibbs, J., Losey, J.E., Danforth, B.N., 2015. Negative effects of
621 pesticides on wild bee communities can be buffered by landscape context. Proc. R.

622 Soc. B Biol. Sci. 282, 20150299–20150299. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2015.0299>.

623 Petit, S., Firbank, L., 2006. Predicting the risk of losing parcels of semi-natural habitat to
624 intensive agriculture. *Agric. Ecosyst. Environ.* 115 (1–4), 277–280.
625 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2005.11.029>.

626 Pilling, E., Campbell, P., Coulson, M., Ruddle, N., Tornier, I. 2013. A Four-Year Field
627 Program Investigating Long-Term Effects of Repeated Exposure of Honey Bee
628 Colonies to Flowering Crops Treated with Thiamethoxam. *PLoS ONE* 8(10): e77193.
629 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0077193>.

630

631 Potts, S.G., Vulliamy, B., Roberts, S., O’Toole, C., Dafni, A., Ne’eman, G., Willmer, P.,
632 2005. Role of nesting resources in organizing diverse bee communities in a
633 Mediterranean landscape. *Ecol. Entomol.* 30, 78–85. [https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0307-](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0307-6946.2005.00662.x)
634 [6946.2005.00662.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0307-6946.2005.00662.x).

635 QGIS Development Team. 2016. QGIS Geographic Information System 2.18 Las Palmas.
636 Open Source Geospatial Foundation. URL <http://qgis.org>. (Accessed 15 December
637 2019).

638 Quintana, A.M., Parrado-Rosselli, A., Ramírez, B.H., 2017. Impact of the proximate and
639 underlying causes on the change of the Andean and High Andean forest of the
640 municipality of Chámeza (Casanare - Colombia). Master thesis. Universidad Distrital
641 Francisco José de Caldas.
642 [http://repository.udistrital.edu.co/bitstream/11349/5869/1/QuintanaLinaresAng%
643 \[c3%a9licaMar%
c3%ada2017.pdf\]\(http://repository.udistrital.edu.co/bitstream/11349/5869/1/QuintanaLinaresAng%c3%a9licaMar%c3%ada2017.pdf\). \(Accessed 20 October 2019\)](http://repository.udistrital.edu.co/bitstream/11349/5869/1/QuintanaLinaresAng%c3%a9licaMar%c3%ada2017.pdf)

644 R Core Team, 2019. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R
645 Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. R package version 0.3.3.0. URL
646 <https://www.R-project.org/>.

647 Rader, R., Bartomeus, I., Garibaldi, L.A., Garratt, M.P.D., Howlett, B.G., Winfree, R.,
648 Cunningham, S.A., Mayfield, M.M., Arthur, A.D., Andersson, G.K.S., Bommarco, R.,
649 Brittain, C., Carvalheiro, L.G., Chacoff, N.P., Entling, M.H., Foully, B., Freitas, B.M.,
650 Gemmill-Herren, B., Ghazoul, J., Griffin, S.R., Gross, C.L., Herbertsson, L., Herzog,
651 F., Hipólito, J., Jaggar, S., Jauker, F., Klein, A.M., Kleijn, D., Krishnan, S., Lemos,
652 C.Q., Lindström, S.A.M., Mandelik, Y., Monteiro, V.M., Nelson, W., Nilsson, L.,
653 Pattemore, D.E., Pereira, N.D.O., Pisanty, G., Potts, S.G., Reemer, M., Rundlöf, M.,
654 Sheffield, C.S., Scheper, J., Schüepp, C., Smith, H.G., Stanley, D.A., Stout, J.C.,
655 Szentgyörgyi, H., Taki, H., Vergara, C.H., Viana, B.F., Woyciechowski, M., 2016.
656 Non-bee insects are important contributors to global crop pollination. *Proc. Natl.*
657 *Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* 113 (1), 146-151. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1517092112>.

658 Rodríguez Eraso, N., Armenteras-Pascual, D., Alumbrosos, J.R., 2013. Land use and land
659 cover change in the Colombian Andes: Dynamics and future scenarios. *J. Land Use*
660 *Sci.* 8, 154-174. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1747423X.2011.650228>.

661 Rundlöf, M., Andersson, G.K.S., Bommarco, R., Fries, I., Hederström, V., Herbertsson, L.,
662 Jonsson, O., Klatt, B.K., Pedersen, T.R., Yourstone, J., Smith, H.G., 2015. Seed
663 coating with a neonicotinoid insecticide negatively affects wild bees. *Nature* 521, 77-
664 80. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature14420>.

665 Sanchez-Bayo, F., Goka, K., 2014. Pesticide residues and bees - A risk assessment. *PLoS*
666 *One* 9(4): e94482. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0094482>.

667 Sánchez Fory, P.A., Sánchez Mosquera, I., Bohórquez Cháaux, A., Ramírez, H., Medina
668 Cano, C.I., Lobo Arias, M., 2010. Genetic Variability of the Colombian Collection of
669 Lulo (*Solanum quitoense* Lam) and Related Species of Section *Lasiocarpa*. Rev. Fac.
670 Nac. Agron. Medellín. 63, 5465-5476. <https://doi.org/10.1021/jf801515p>.
671 Schreinemachers, P., Tipraqsa, P., 2012. Agricultural pesticides and land use intensification
672 in high, middle, and low-income countries. Food Policy. 37 (6), 616-626.
673 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodpol.2012.06.003>.
674 Stoner, K.A., Eitzer, B.D., 2012. Movement of soil-applied imidacloprid and thiamethoxam
675 into nectar and pollen of squash (*Cucurbita pepo*). 7(6), e39114. PLoS One.
676 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0039114>.
677 Stoner, K.A., Eitzer, B.D., 2013. Using a Hazard Quotient to Evaluate Pesticide Residues
678 Detected in Pollen Trapped from Honey bees (*Apis mellifera*) in Connecticut. PLoS
679 One. 11(7), e0159696. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0077550>.
680 Switzer, C.M., Combes, S.A., 2016. The neonicotinoid pesticide, imidacloprid, affects
681 *Bombus impatiens* (bumblebee) sonication behavior when consumed at doses below
682 the LD50. Ecotoxicology. 6, 1150-1159. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10646-016-1669-z>.
683 University of Hertfordshire, 2020. PPDB: Pesticide Properties Database, Lufenuron (Ref:
684 CGA 184699). <https://sitem.herts.ac.uk/aeru/footprint/es/Reports/420.htm>. (Accessed
685 13 March 2019)
686 Winfree, R., Reilly, J.R., Bartomeus, I., Cariveau, D.P., Williams, N.M., Gibbs, J., 2018.
687 Species turnover promotes the importance of bee diversity for crop pollination at
688 regional scales. Science. 359 (6377), 791-793.
689 <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aao2117>.

- 690 Winfree, R., Williams, N.M., Gaines, H., Ascher, J.S., Kremen, C., 2008. Wild bee
691 pollinators provide the majority of crop visitation across land-use gradients in New
692 Jersey and Pennsylvania, USA. J. Appl. Ecol. 45, 793–802.
693 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2664.2007.01418.x>.
- 694 Winter, P.A., 1990. Profenofos: an acute contact study with the honey bee. Laboratory
695 report No. 108 – 321. Conducted by Wildlife International Ltd.
696 [https://www3.epa.gov/pesticides/chem_search/cleared_reviews/csr_PC-111401_19-](https://www3.epa.gov/pesticides/chem_search/cleared_reviews/csr_PC-111401_19-Jun-91_036.pdf)
697 [Jun-91_036.pdf](https://www3.epa.gov/pesticides/chem_search/cleared_reviews/csr_PC-111401_19-Jun-91_036.pdf) (Accessed, March 13, 2019)
- 698 Wislocki, P.G., Grosso, L.S., Dybas, R.A., 1989. Environmental aspects of abamectin use
699 in crop protection, In: Campbell W.C. (eds) Ivermectin and Abamectin. Springer, New
700 York, NY. pp 182-200. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4612-3626-9_13.

Supplementary information:

Figure S1.a. Satellite image of the study area, orange dots are the locations of the sampled farms and the blue triangle is the urban area of Chameza. b. Orthophoto constructed with drone pictures from a farm within a simple landscape at 500m (72% Pastures, 15% Natural habitat, 13% Lulo crops) and c. Orthophoto constructed with drone pictures from a farm within a complex landscape at 500m (b. 37% Pastures, 62% Natural habitat, 0.3% Lulo crops).

Table S2. Location, height, and landcover type proportions of every farm in the study at 500m around the lulo crop fields.

Farm	Village	Height (m)	Pasture	Natural habitat	Lulo crops	Other crops
1	Centro Sur	1396	0.66	0.30	0.01	0.04
2	Mundo viejo	1376	0.68	0.27	0.01	0.05
3	Chuyagua	1309	0.60	0.38	0.00	0.02
4	Teguita baja	1253	0.53	0.46	0.00	0.01
5	Teguita baja	1304	0.37	0.62	0.00	0.00
6	Barriales	1333	0.74	0.21	0.01	0.05
7	Centro Sur	1328	0.79	0.20	0.00	0.01
8	Centro Norte	1483	0.67	0.27	0.06	0.00
9	Chuyagua	1041	0.72	0.15	0.13	0.00
10	Barriales	1083	0.54	0.44	0.00	0.01

Table S3. Concentrations of nine pesticides tested in anthers of *S. quitoense* crops in each of the 10 farms included in the study in Casanare, Colombia. The minimum level of quantification was 0.1 µg/kg, while the minimum level of detection was 0.05µg/kg. () represents when the compound at the farm was not detected. The last row shows the total hazard quotients (HQ) calculated per farm based on honey bee oral LD50 values from the literature.

Pesticides tested	Oral LD50 (µg/bee)*	Pesticide residues found in every farm sampled (µg/kg)									
		Farm No.									
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Insecticides											
Imidacloprid ^a	0.0039	3.2	—	204.6	14.7	2.9	213.9	13063	—	0.6	408.5
Methomyl ^b	0.24	1.9	26.3	—	—	—	—	0.7	—	—	—
Abamectin ^c	0.009	—	—	—	—	—	2	211.1	—	—	—
Bifenthrin ^d	0.34	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Profenofos ^e	0.095	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Lufenuron ^f	198	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Fungicides											
Difenoconazole ^a	178	—	10.1	1.4	—	—	245.4	3.5	—	—	2.5
Propamocarb ^f	84	1.8	38.1	6.6	27.4	5.4	399.5	7.1	6.9	1.3	38.5
Cymoxanil ^g	85.29	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Total HQ per farm: Σ(Concentration/LD50)		828.5	110.1	52462	3769.6	743.7	55075	3372945.8	0.1	153.9	104744

*Source of Oral LD50s:

a. ECOTOX, 2019

b. Clinch, 1981; c. Wislocki *et al.*, 1989; d. Ellis *et al.*, 1997; e. Winter., 1990; f.

PPDB (University of Hertfordshire); g. EFSA Scientific Report (2008).