# Animal pollinated crops and cultivars – a quantitative assessment of Pollinator Dependence values and evaluation of methodological approaches

**Authors:** Catarina Siopa[1*], Luísa G. Carvalheiro[2], Helena Castro[1], João Loureiro[1], Sílvia Castro[1]

[1]Centre for Functional Ecology, Department of Life Sciences, University of Coimbra, 3000-456, Coimbra, Portugal

[2]Departamento de Ecologia, Universidade Federal de Goiás, 74001-970, Goiânia, Brazil

***Corresponding author:** Catarina Siopa, email: catarinasiopa@gmail.com

## Abstract

Crop pollinator dependence (PD) values are key when assessing a pollinator's contribution to agriculture, guiding management plans and policies for sustainable crop production. However, available global compilations of crops PD are outdated and neglect variability between accessions (variety/cultivar) and pollen limitation (PL), i.e. the production lost due to inadequate pollen receipt.

Here, we obtained quantitative PD values for animal pollinated crops and their accessions, using data from available pollination experiments worldwide. We also tested pollination methodologies to assess their impact in PD values and to define suitable methodological guidelines for future pollination studies.

We provide a list of continuous PD values for 141 crops, including 317 accessions and 37 crops not listed in previous assessments. We found that globally, 75% of the animal pollinated crops depend highly on pollinators, with more than 40% of their production being associated with animal pollination. Pollen limitation was detected in 52% of the dataset entries, indicating that estimates calculated with open pollination studies underestimate crop pollinator dependence and so fail to represent the true pollinator contribution to food production.

The quantitative data provided here enables a more accurate estimation of pollinator contribution to food production, thus, future studies may use these values for better assessments of the value of pollinators for food security at local, regional and global scales. Additionally, future crop pollination studies should consider crop accessions and include pollen supplementation treatments for a more accurate assessment of the contribution animal pollination makes.

**Keywords:** Agriculture, animal pollinator dependence, crop yield, ecosystem service, hand pollen supplementation, pollen limitation, pollination.

# Introduction

Biotic pollination is a crucial biodiversity-dependent ecosystem service that contributes to crop yield, supports food security, and provides other ecosystem services (Dicks et al., 2021; Power, 2010). Together with managed pollinators, diverse and abundant wild pollinator communities ensure the reproduction of pollinator-dependent crops, increasing yields and/or improving the quality of fruit and seeds, even in self-compatible crops (Klatt et al., 2014; Klein et al., 2003). Unfortunately, there is evidence that pollinator numbers are on the declining, driven primarily by human-induced changes, and pollination services may be at risk, with implications to food security and human well-being (Potts, Imperatriz-Fonseca, et al., 2016; Dicks et al., 2021).

The ability of a given crop field to achieve its maximum production potential depends on numerous environmental factors, such as nutrient and water availability, biotic interactions, and pest levels (Licker et al., 2010). For pollinator-dependent plant crops that have as their primary product fruits or seeds, pollination is directly linked with crop yield. In these crops, yield is mainly the result of two components (Fig. 1): (1) crop auto-pollination ability (the ability to produce fruits and/or seeds in the absence of pollination vectors, Fig. 1 - AUTO bar) and (2) pollination services available in each place and time (open pollination, Fig. 1 - OPEN bar). Altogether, they result in yields that, in optimal conditions, are theoretically equal to (3) the production under optimal levels of pollination (Fig. 1 - OPT bar).

The difference between open and optimal yields is known as pollen limitation (PL; Fig. 1), and it is caused by insufficient and/or inefficient pollination services (Bartomeus et al., 2014; Toledo-Hernández et al., 2017). Following Liebig’s law (Liebig, 1840), crop yield is determined by the most limiting factor. In pollinator-dependent crops, when no other factors limit yield (as expected in optimized agricultural systems), pollination service may be the limiting factor (Tamburini et al., 2019). PL leads to reduced productivity through a quantitative reduction in the amount of a crop produced and/or a loss in crop quality (Vaissière et al. 2011).

The contribution of animal pollinators to crop yields (Fig. 1) can vary significantly due to spatial, temporal, and biotic factors (Bishop & Nakagawa, 2021; Mallinger et al., 2021; Webber et al., 2020). Pollinator communities are largely impacted by factors such as regional biodiversity, landscape structure, environmental conditions during flowering, and local management practices (Holland et al., 2017; Mota et al., 2022; Potts et al., 2010; Senapathi et al., 2017) and, consequently, pollination services provided by pollinator communities are likely to show significant variation.

The relative difference in yield resulting from crop auto-pollination ability and optimal pollination corresponds to the potential pollinator's contribution to production, i.e. the true level of PD, a metric highly used to endorse the importance of pollinators to humans (Fig. 1). Estimates of pollinator's contribution to agricultural production can guide both farm management practices and policymaking regarding pollinator conservation (Potts, Ngo, et al., 2016). PD values are tools to guide farmers towards practices that enhance pollinator communities, benefiting crop yield. For crops highly reliant on animal pollinators, implementing management strategies tailored to protect, sustain and, if needed, attract pollinators to the crop field becomes essential. These strategies typically prioritize the reduction of agrochemicals usage and the promotion of floral resources, habitat connectivity and nesting sites (Mota et al. 2022; Bartomeus et al. 2014; Potts et al. 2010). Furthermore, by combining crops' PD with their economic value, we can assess the direct economic impact of pollinators on crop production and crop markets (Gallai et al., 2009; Potts, Imperatriz-Fonseca, et al., 2016; Silva et al., 2021).

Studies such as Free (1993) and Klein et al. (2007) widely assessed pollinator's dependence of crops. Klein et al. (2007), the most comprehensive and widely used study, compiled PD values in four categories ("little", "modest", "high", and "essential") for 91 major global crops. This index constitutes the base for current economic assessments of pollination value at regional, national and global scales, facilitating conservation actions and initiatives focussed on pollinators and their importance (e.g. Gallai et al., 2009; Millard et al., 2023; Potts, Ngo, et al., 2016). However, due to the continuous emergence of crops and new studies being available, a revision on PD levels of crops is currently needed. Recent syntheses after the seminal work of Klein et al. (2007) include PD values for emergent crops; nevertheless, they are usually focused on a few economically important crops or specific regions of the globe (see Bishop & Nakagawa, 2021; Giannini et al., 2015; Mallinger et al., 2021). Additionally, within a crop, different accessions (plants that share similar and/or selected traits, including cultivars, varieties and other infraspecific taxonomic levels) may differ greatly in self-compatibility and auto-pollination ability (e.g. Kendall et al., 2020; Klatt et al., 2014) and, hence, different PD levels are expected (e.g. Bishop & Nakagawa, 2021; Carvalheiro et al., 2010; Marini et al., 2015). However, detailed information about PD levels in crop's accessions is scattered in the literature, making it difficult to compile, and to our knowledge, it is seldom accounted for in global studies.

Despite the growing availability of studies quantifying PD, there are challenges with the currently used methodologies, which could be underrepresenting the importance of pollinators and their associated economic value. Crops' PD literature usually evaluates crop production after open pollination (i.e. pollination provided by locally available pollinator communities), comparing it with the output after pollinator exclusion (Fig. 1). Consequently, PD values using open pollination will vary according to the local pollinator communities. Hence, we propose that hand pollen supplementation is more suitable to estimate PD since open pollination may lead to underestimations of PD values. For example, for the same plant species, a PD estimation based on an open pollination reference, in an impoverished landscape with unfavourable conditions for pollinators will generate lower PD values than a similar experiment run in a landscape with rich and abundant pollinator communities able to provide suitable pollination services. Because PL is common in wild plants and crops (Bennett et al., 2018; Olhnuud et al., 2022; Potts, Ngo, et al., 2016; Sáez et al., 2022), we expect lower estimates of PD using open pollination than with hand-pollination. Moreover, as flower manipulations may affect flower and fruit development (e.g. Hedhly et al., 2009), we expect different methodologies associated with hand pollen supplementations (e.g. emasculation and/or bagging of flowers) to impact PD estimates negatively. In contrast, experiments conducted on a smaller scale, such as individual flower level, may overestimate PD levels. This can be attributed to resource allocation, where a successfully pollinated flower, such as in hand pollen supplementations, triggers a reallocation of resources, favouring higher-quality pollinations compared to other flowers of the plant (Wesselingh, 2007). Thus, PD values are expected to be higher when pollination treatments are performed at smaller scales (e.g. flower level) than at larger ones (e.g. plant level).

We gathered information on pollination experiments for animal pollinated crops to test the aforementioned expectations and propose a methodological framework to estimate the PD of crops. Finally, we provide a list of continuous PD values for animal pollinated crops, including crop accessions whenever available. We believe this list can support more accurate economic assessments of the contribution pollinators make to food production at local, regional and global scales and guide policymaking and farm management practices regarding pollinator conservation.

# Material and Methods

## Dataset development

To assess animal pollination's contribution to crops production, we used data focused on pollination experiments performed in agricultural contexts and open conditions, from the PolLimCrop database (unpublished data). The search was based on a list of animal pollinated plant crops from which fruit and/or seeds are used as food and goods (FAO's list of crops, available at [https://www.fao.org/faostat/en/#data/QCL (2021)]; list of taxa given in Supporting Information, "List of taxa included in the search").

To build a dataset of crops' PD, we selected studies with three treatments. First, a hand pollen supplementation treatment, where flowers were pollen supplemented to achieve optimal pollination. Second, an open pollination treatment, where flowers received pollination services naturally, from the environment. Third, a pollinator exclusion treatment, where flowers were excluded from animal pollination through caging or bagging. We retrieved the species and common names of the crop and part of the crop economically used (fruit or seed), with species name standardized using World Flora Online. From the selected studies, the following information was also extracted: 1) production results associated with pollination treatments: fruit set, fruit weight, seed set, seed number and/or seed weight; 2) data related to geographical aspects of the study, i.e. continent and country; and 3) records of the additional treatments undertaken that were supplemental to the pollination treatments. These treatments were designated: H – hand pollen supplementation, only; BH – pollinator exclusion and hand pollen supplementation; EH – emasculation and hand pollen supplementation; BEH – pollinator exclusion, emasculation and hand pollen supplementation. The scale of the pollination experiment was also noted in terms of whether the pollination treatment was applied the complete plant, branch, inflorescence (including flower clusters) or individual flower. Additional details on the characteristics of the used dataset can be found in the Supporting Information. Further details on extracted variables are provided in Table S1.

Pollinator dependence estimation

PD values were calculated using the following equation:

PD = 1 – [pollinator exclusion production / pollinator-associated production]

where *pollinator exclusion production* refers to the production in the absence of pollinators, and *pollinator-associated production* refers to the production associated with animal pollinator visitation (i.e. hand pollen supplementation or open pollination).

Where PD estimates were provided for multiple production variables, the values derived from the commercially used parts were used here (seed and/or fruit). In fruit crops, fruit-related production variables were used for PD calculation, i.e. fruit set and fruit weight. For seed crops, seed set, and seed number and weight were used, in addition to fruit set. In some cases, where both fruit and seed parts are economically used, fruit and seed-related production variables were used to calculate PD values. When several production variables were provided, a mean value of the obtained PD values was calculated and used. Two PD values were calculated for each entry, one using hand pollen supplementation and pollinator exclusion treatments (PD-SUP) and the other using open pollination and pollinator exclusion treatment (PD-OPEN). PD ranged between 0 and 1, with 0 representing a lack of PD and 1 representing the highest level.

To identify methodological problems with pollinator exclusion and hand supplementation methodologies, outliers were visually inspected. In four entries (out of

564), pollinator exclusion production was 25% higher than pollinator-associated production and were likely related with methodological problems related with the pollinator exclusion methodology. Therefore, PD values were not calculated for those four entries. For the 13 remaining entries where pollinator exclusion production was higher than pollinator-associated production, PD estimates were considered to be zero. Additionally, in 11 entries, pollen supplementation production was 25% lower than open pollination production suggesting methodological problems with the hand supplementation methodology. PD values were not calculated for those entries. To guarantee that the removal of these 15 studies did not affect the main findings of this study, the statistical analyses were performed with the entire dataset (see *Statistical analyses* section).

A final PD value was obtained for each entry (defined here as PD-final), using either hand pollen supplementation or open pollination treatment, by selecting the maximum value obtained. Variation in production variables is expected, and thus, cases where open pollination overcomes hand pollen supplementation may occur. Cases where production of open pollination are much higher than after hand pollination might reflect methodological issues or lack of efficiency or success in hand pollen supplementation; such cases may affect the data and lead to misleading conclusions. Here, entries in which PD-OPEN was 25% higher than PD-SUP were not used in statistical analyses. These represented only 11 entries (out of 564) and did not significantly affect overall conclusions (see Supporting Information). For every database entry, PD-SUP, PD-OPEN and PD-final was added to the dataset for the subsequent statistical analyses.

Statistical analyses

A total of 165 records contained hand pollen supplementation, open pollination and pollinator exclusion and were included in statistical analyses. To compare PD levels after open pollination and hand pollen supplementation, General Linear Mixed-Effects Models (GLMMs) were created using PD values from both treatments, with “treatment type” as an explanatory variable. To account for variation associated with crop identity, “crop” was included as a random variable in all models. Similarly, “article code” was also used as a random variable to remove confounding effects of within-study aspects.

To evaluate if PD values depended on specific aspects of the methodologies used, analyses were performed using PD-final obtained in our dataset. In particular, GLMMs were performed to analyse the effects of hand pollen supplementation methodology and scale of the pollination experiment on PD values. Hand pollen supplementation methodology included four techniques (see Table S3, ‘supplement type’). Scale included four experimental scales (see Table S3, ‘scale’). Again, “crop” and “article code” were used as random factors. GLMMs were performed using function “lmer” of the R package “lme4” (Bates et al., 2014), with logit transformation of adjusting factor of 0.01 of the R package “car” (Fox & Weisberg, 2019). Wald chi-square analyses were used to calculate the effect of tested variables on PD values. We then ran post hoc pairwise comparisons to test for differences within treatments of supplement type and scale, using R package “emmeans” (Lenth et al., 2018). All analyses were rerun with the complete dataset (including the above mentioned 15 entries) to evaluate if similar trends were observed. The studies on apples constituted 33% of PD values in all performed analyses (see Table S2, Crop “Apple”). To test if such a large set of studies on one crop influenced our results, all analyses without apple’s entries were rerun.

To enable comparison with previous global studies, we grouped our continuous PD values into the classes used by Klein et al. (2007; little: 0–0.09 PD, modest: 0.10–0.39, high: 0.40–0.89, essential: 0.90–1.00). All analyses and graphs were obtained in R software (version 4.2.1).

Pollinator dependence – Compilation table

To provide a comprehensive list of PD values for animal pollinated crops and their accessions, we created a 'compilation table' (Table S2) containing the mean PD values calculated for the 165 records used in statistical analyses, and a set of 64 studies reporting only hand-pollen supplementation or open pollination (thus excluded from statistical analyses). A full list of contributing studies is given in the Supporting Information.

Mean values were obtained using PD-final from each entry available, plus PD-final of the additional studies (Table S2). Values of PD ranged from 0 to 1, with negative values being considered as 0, indicating no animal pollinator dependence. Treatments that contributed to mean PD values (either hand pollen supplementation treatment, open pollination, or both) are indicated in the dataset. Similarly, mean PD values were obtained and assembled for all the available accessions within crops (Table S3).

# Results

## Open pollination versus hand pollen supplementation

A total of 165 records, corresponding to 91 different crops, were used in statistical analyses, including 549 entries with PD values (representing different crops, accessions, years and experimental sites). A map with the geographical distribution of studies and entries included in data analyses is provided (Fig. 2a). A detailed list of record type (e.g. article, thesis or proceeding) are provided in the Supporting Information (Table S4). Crops with most entry values of PD were apple, oilseed rape and almond (representing 33.1%, 6.4% and 4.2% of total entries, respectively). Twenty-seven crops were represented by one value of PD only.

PD values estimated after hand pollen supplementation-associated production were significantly higher (ca. 5.7% higher on average) than those estimated after open pollination ($\chi^2$=38.5260, $P$<0.0001; Fig. 2b; Table S4). Hand pollen supplementation gave higher PD values than open pollination in 51.5% of cases (Fig. 2c, Fig. S1a). Hand pollen supplementation and open pollination gave similar PD values in 23.9% of cases (Fig. 2c, Fig. S1a). Finally, hand pollen supplementation led to lower PD values than open pollination in 24.6% of cases (Fig. 2c, Fig. S1a).

## Methodological considerations regarding hand pollen supplementation

No significant differences were found in PD values among pollen supplementation techniques ($\chi^2$=4.6863, $P$=0.1963; Fig. S1b; Table S5). However, signs of resource allocation were observed, with significant differences in PD values among experimental scales used in pollination experiments ($\chi^2$=8.0840, $P$=0.0443; Table S5). Despite these signs, no significant differences were observed among scales in post hoc tests (Fig. S1c;

Table S6). Similar results were obtained when rerunning analyses without apple studies (Tables S8-S10), and with and without the studies removed (Tables S11-S13).

## Crop pollinator dependence values

Mean PD values are provided for 141 animal pollinated crops. A list of taxa with PD estimated values is given in Supporting Information (Table S2). Information on specific PD values of crop accessions (including cultivars, varieties and other infraspecific taxonomic levels) is provided for 94 crops, comprising 317 individual crop accessions (Table S3).

The mean value of PD (PD-final) across all crops of the list was 0.63 ± 0.30 (mean ± SD). Values varied, as expected, from no PD (value of 0) to complete PD (value of 1); however, a concentration of values around 1 was observed, with 27.0% of the crops having high PD values (PD ≥ 0.90) (Fig. 3a).

When considering the animal pollinator dependent classes defined by Klein et al. (2007), 74.5% of the crops were classified as "high" (67 crops, 47.5%) or "essential" (38 crops, 27.0%) (Fig. 3b), representing a higher number of crops than in Klein et al. (2007). A similar number of crops were observed in the "modest" class in both studies, here representing 19.9% of the total crops (28 crops). Contrarily, the number of crops classified as "little" was lower than in Klein et al. (2007), comprising only 5.7% of crops in our compilation (8 crops; Fig. 3b).

# Discussion

## Crop pollinator dependence values

This study provides a new compilation of PD values for animal pollinated crops. For several crop species, PD values given here differ from previous global assessments (Klein et al., 2007), with many crops having higher PD values than listed previously. 75% of the animal pollinated crops were categorized in PD classes “high” or “essential”, an increased ratio compared with compilations such as Klein et al. (2007). Additionally, compared with previous approaches, the list comprises, for the first time, continuous PD values for 141 worldwide crops, including 317 crop accessions, estimates for 37 crops (highlighted in bold, Table S2) not listed previously or with no data in former global assessments, and detailed data for several crops that were once merged in large groups (see Fig. 4). By providing PD values discriminated for individual crop species and their accessions, our study contributes with vital and, until now, neglected information.

Several PD values of individual crops were higher than in previous compilations (e.g. *Citrus*, durian, strawberry, sunflower). These differences are mainly explained by the fact that PD values were obtained through a different methodology, here using hand pollen supplementation instead of open pollination (primary treatment used in previous estimates) to obtain final PD value. As hand pollen supplementation accounts for effects of PL, it provides more accurate measures of PD. Once PD estimations are usually based on open levels of pollination, previous studies and compilations are substantially underestimating animal pollinator’s importance for crop production.

We found wide variation in the PD values reported within crops. This might be expected since the degree of self-compatibility and auto-pollination ability has been shown to vary among crop accessions (e.g. sunflower, Carvalheiro et al., 2011; oilseed rape, Hudewenz et al., 2014). Knowledge of the pollination requirements of crop accessions is crucial for suitable management decisions (Hudewenz et al., 2014), and is becoming a particularly useful in regions where pollinator loss is, or is anticipated to be, more pronounced (Potts, Ngo, et al., 2016). For example, in pollinator-impoverished locations, when pollinator communities are insufficient to provide the needed pollination services to a crop, selecting accessions that are less dependent on animal pollination may be a suitable solution to ameliorate PL. Unfortunately, 29% of the studies analysed here did not provide information about crop accessions (or any other infraspecific taxonomic level, such as cultivar, variety, forma or clone), hindering the compilation of precise data. Considering the importance of this information (Hudewenz et al., 2014), we recommend that future works should always provide information and data for each accession of the crop under study.

The optimal pollination level from the plant perspective (i.e. plant fitness) differs from that of farmers perspective (i.e. agronomic and economic yield). To follow farmers' perspective, PD value was calculated using different production variables, depending on the part of the crop economically used (fruit or seed). Quantity (e.g. fruit set) and quality (e.g. fruit weight) production traits were considered, to accurately account for the impact of animal pollination at both levels. Studies on PD often focus on quantitative variables, with mixed responses between these and qualitative variables (e.g. Bartomeus et al. 2014; Stein et al. 2017). Here, however, only 30% of the entries presented quantity and quality variables. Hence, we recommend that future experiments evaluate production variables related to both levels.

## Open pollination vs. hand pollen supplementation to calculate PD values

Hand pollen supplementation led to higher PD values than open pollination in 51.5% of datapoints that had information in both treatments. These results are consistent with our predictions and indicate that PL is common, reducing yield level and, consequently, underestimating potential pollinator's contribution. Therefore, in locations where pollination services are inadequate and/or impoverished, such as landscapes of poor quality due to high levels of fragmentation and/or simplification (Aizen & Feinsinger, 2003, Nicholson et al., 2017), hand pollen supplementation is a more suitable treatment to achieve optimal crop yield and obtain an accurate estimate of PD value. However, despite the importance of accurate PD estimates to value pollinator's contribution to production systems, and even though hand pollen supplementation is widely used to study PL in wild plants (e.g. Bennett et al., 2018; Knight et al., 2005), in crops, its use for the calculation of PD has been rare (but see Bishop & Nakagawa, 2021; Garibaldi et al., 2011; Garratt et al., 2021). Based on these results, we recommend that hand pollen supplementation is included in pollination experiments that aim to assess the contribution of animal pollination to crops. A complete experimental design for such purposes is provided below and in Box 1.

## Methodological guidelines for hand pollen supplementations

When performing hand pollen supplementations, assuring efficiency is critical (see Box 1). However, in plant families with complex flower structures or with flowers sensitive to manipulation, this can be challenging to achieve. In such cases, animal pollinators may perform better at pollinating than hand pollen supplementation by humans since animals are adapted to exploit floral resources. Thus, the fact that hand pollen supplementation produced lower production values in 24.6% of the data points compared with open pollination is not entirely unexpected. It is possible that in these studies, the supplementation of pollen was not ideal, or that over-pollination led to reduced yield (Bishop et al. 2020). This may represent a limitation of the dataset used in our study, which can lead to the undervaluation of PD levels. Indeed, technical approaches used in hand pollen supplementation, such as type of supplementation, scale at which pollination experiments are done and pollen source, are known to affect yield in certain crops (e.g. Webber et al., 2020).

Emasculation of flowers prior to hand pollen supplementation and bagging plants after hand pollination are practices often performed on pollination experiments to exclude production associated with auto-pollination and/or avoid undesirable external pollen, respectively (e.g. Chacoff & Aizen, 2007; Kendall et al., 2020). Here, no significant differences were obtained between standard hand pollen supplementation and supplementation with some of the techniques detailed above, indicating that supplementation using these methods provide reliable estimates of PD or, at least, estimates comparable to hand pollinations.

PD values are expected to be higher in pollination treatments conducted at smaller scales (e.g. flower level) than at higher ones (e.g. plant level), as resources for fruit/seed development are usually limited and will be preferentially (re)allocated to flowers with higher pollination quality (Webber et al., 2020). Although no significant differences were observed among different scales, higher PD values were obtained in experiments that used flower as a scale, with marginal *p*-values obtained when comparing flower vs. inflorescence scales (*P*=0.0762). Therefore, more research focused on resource allocation occurrence is needed to fully disentangle the impact of lower scales on associated production levels. In the meantime, studies should indicate the treatment scale and increase the scale whenever possible to avoid resource allocation problems.

Hand pollen supplementation should be included in crop pollination experiments to account for PL, providing a more accurate method to calculate PD values and assess total pollinator's contribution to crop production. Yet, it should be bear in mind that the inclusion of hand pollen supplementation increases the time and complexity of such experiments, particularly in mass flowering or self-pruning crops (where sample size needs to be significantly increased to compensate for self-pruning losses) or in plants with complex, fragile flower structures (demanding more time for hand pollen supplementations). Therefore, when designing a pollination experiment, all factors linked with crop reproductive traits should be considered (Young & Young, 1992), acknowledging the limitations and advantages of selected treatments (see Box 1).

# Conclusions

This compilation offers valuable PD values at both crop and accession levels, enabling precise economic assessments for individual crops and subsequently supporting informed decisions in the management of animal pollinated crops. Our results highlight the importance of recognizing that the commonly applied method of assessing PD (comparing fruit set in plants exposed vs isolated from pollinators) can lead to underestimations of PD values. Due to this, the value of animal pollination to production of crops may be higher than previous studies established. Given that most published studies on pollinator's contribution to crops use PD values obtained through methodologies that did not account for pollen limitation, it is probable that pollinator's contribution to crops' local and global production, international trade markets, and economic value of pollinators are substantially undervalued.

## Authors' contributions

CS, LGC and SC developed hypothesis and statistical methods, which were discussed with HC and JL. CS and HC led literature search and data extraction. CS, HC and SC performed data validation. CS wrote the first draft, and all remaining authors edited and commented on earlier versions of the manuscript.

## Acknowledgements

The authors thank the anonymous reviewers and Robin Payne for their manuscript suggestions. This work was funded by the Integrated Programme of Scientific Research and Technological Development CULTIVAR (CENTRO-01-0145-FEDER-000020), co-financed by the Regional Operational Programme Centro-2020, Portugal-2020 and European Union, through ERDF. Portuguese Foundation for Science and Technology (FCT) financed CS through the fellowship SFRH/BD/145962/2019, HC through national funds by the framework contract foreseen in numbers 4-6 of article 23, Decree-Law 57/2016, and SC through the Scientific Employment Stimulus 2021.02697.CEECIND. LGC was funded by the Brazilian Conselho Nacional de Desenvolvimento Científico e Tecnológico CNPq (307625/2021-4).

## Conflict of Interest

None declared.

## Data accessibility statement

Additional supporting information can be found online in Supporting Information. Upon acceptance of the manuscript, data will be available via figshare, with a provided link.

## Supporting Information

Supporting information can be found online in Supporting Information section.

## References

Aguirre-Gutiérrez, J., Biesmeijer, J. C., van Loon, E., Reemer, M., WallisDeVries, M. F., & Carvalheiro, L. G. (2015). Susceptibility of pollinators to ongoing landscape changes depends on landscape history. *Diversity and Distributions*, *21(10)*, 1129-1140. https://doi.org/10.1111/ddi.12350

Aizen, M. A., & Feinsinger, P. (2003). Bees not to be? Responses of insect pollinator faunas and flower pollination to habitat fragmentation. *How landscapes change: human disturbance and ecosystem fragmentation in the Americas*, 111-129. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-05238-9_7

Aizen, M. A., Garibaldi, L. A., Cunningham, S. A., & Klein, A. M. (2009). How much does agriculture depend on pollinators? Lessons from long-term trends in crop production. *Annals of Botany*, *103(9)*, 1579-1588. https://doi.org/10.1093/aob/mcp076

Bartomeus, I., Potts, S. G., Steffan-Dewenter, I., Vaissiere, B. E., Woyciechowski, M., Krewenka, K. M., Tscheulin T., Roberts S. P. M., Szentgyörgyi H., Westphal C. & Bommarco R. (2014). Contribution of insect pollinators to crop yield and quality varies with agricultural intensification. *PeerJ*, *2*, e328. https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.328

Bates, D., Mächler, M., Bolker, B., & Walker, S. (2014). Fitting linear mixed-effects models using lme4. *arXiv* preprint arXiv:1406.5823.

Bennett, J. M., Steets, J. A., Burns, J. H., Durka, W., Vamosi, J. C., Arceo-Gómez, G., Burd, M., Burkle, L. A., Ellis, A. G., Freitas, L., Li, J., Rodger, J. G., Wolowski, M., Xia, J., Ashman, T-L., & Knight, T. M. (2018). GloPL, a global data base on pollen limitation of plant reproduction. *Scientific Data*, *5(1)*, 1-9. https://doi.org/10.1038/sdata.2018.249

Bishop, J., Garratt, M. P. D., & Breeze, T. D. (2020). Yield benefits of additional pollination to faba bean vary with cultivar, scale, yield parameter and experimental method. *Scientific Reports*, *10(1)*, 2102. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-020-58518-1

Bishop, J., & Nakagawa, S. (2021). Quantifying crop pollinator dependence and its heterogeneity using multi-level meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Ecology*, *58(5)*, 1030-1042. https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2664.13830

Carvalheiro, L. G., Seymour, C. L., Veldtman, R., & Nicolson, S. W. (2010). Pollination services decline with distance from natural habitat even in biodiversity-rich areas. *Journal of Applied Ecology*, *47(4)*, 810-820. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2664.2010.01829.x

Carvalheiro, L. G., Veldtman, R., Shenkute, A. G., Tesfay, G. B., Pirk, C. W. W., Donaldson, J. S., & Nicolson, S. W. (2011). Natural and within-farmland biodiversity enhances crop productivity. *Ecology Letters*, *14(3)*, 251-259. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1461-0248.2010.01579.x

Chacoff, N. P., & Aizen, M. A. (2007). Pollination requirements of pigmented grapefruit (*Citrus paradisi* Macf.) from Northwestern Argentina. *Crop Science*, *47(3)*, 1143-1150.

Dicks, L. V., Breeze, T. D., Ngo, H. T., Senapathi, D., An, J., Aizen, M. A., Basu, P., Buchori, D., Galetto, L., Garibaldi, L. A., Gemmill-Herren, B., Howlett, B. G., Imperatriz-Fonseca, V. L., Johnson, S. D., Kovács-Hostyánszki, A., Kwon, Y. J., Lattorff, H. M. G., Lungharwo, T., Seymour, C. L., and Potts, S. (2021). A global-scale expert assessment of drivers and risks associated with pollinator decline. *Nature Ecology & Evolution*, *5(10)*, 1453-1461. https://doi.org/10.2135/cropsci2006.09.0586

Eilers, E. J., Kremen, C., Smith Greenleaf, S., Garber, A. K., & Klein, A. M. (2011). Contribution of pollinator-mediated crops to nutrients in the human food supply. *PloS one*, *6(6)*, e21363. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0021363

Fox, J., & Weisberg, S. (2019). *An R companion to applied regression*. Sage publications.

Free, J. B. (1993). *Insect pollination of crops* (Ed. 2). Academic Press.

Gallai, N., Salles, J. M., Settele, J., & Vaissière, B. E. (2009). Economic valuation of the vulnerability of world agriculture confronted with pollinator decline. *Ecological economics*, *68(3)*, 810-821. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2008.06.014

Garratt, M. P., de Groot, G. A., Albrecht, M., Bosch, J., Breeze, T. D., Fountain, M. T., Klein, A. M., McKerchar, M., Park, M., Paxton, R. J., Potts, S. G., Pufal, G., Rader, R., Senapathi, G. D., Andersson, G. K. S., Bernauer, O. M., Blitzer, E. J., Boreux, V., Campbell, A., … Zhusupbaeva, A. (2021). Opportunities to reduce pollination deficits and address production shortfalls in an important insect-pollinated crop. *Ecological applications*, *31(8)*, e02445. https://doi.org/10.1002/eap.2445

Garibaldi, L. A., Aizen, M. A., Klein, A. M., Cunningham, S. A., & Harder, L. D. (2011). Global growth and stability of agricultural yield decrease with pollinator dependence. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *108(14)*, 5909-5914. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1012431108

Garibaldi, L. A., Cunningham, S. A., Aizen, M. A., Packer, L., & Harder, L. (2018). The potential for insect pollinators to alleviate global pollination deficits and enhance yield of fruit and seed crops. FAO, 35-53.

Giannini, T. C., Cordeiro, G. D., Freitas, B. M., Saraiva, A. M., & Imperatriz-Fonseca, V. L. (2015). The dependence of crops for pollinators and the economic value of pollination in Brazil. *Journal of Economic Entomology*, *108(3)*, 849-857. https://doi.org/10.1093/jee/tov093

Hedhly, A., Hormaza, J. I. & Herrero, M. (2009). Flower emasculation accelerates ovule degeneration and reduces fruit set in sweet cherry. *Scientia Horticulturae*, *119(4)*, 455-457. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scienta.2008.08.020

Holland, J. M., Douma, J. C., Crowley, L., James, L., Kor, L., Stevenson, D. R. & Smith, B. M. (2017). Semi-natural habitats support biological control, pollination and soil conservation in Europe. A review. *Agronomy for Sustainable Development*, *37(4)*, 1-23. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13593-017-0434-x

Hudewenz, A., Pufal, G., Bögeholz, A. L., & Klein, A. M. (2014). Cross-pollination benefits differ among oilseed rape varieties. *The Journal of Agricultural Science*, *152(5)*, 770-778. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0021859613000440

Kendall, L. K., Gagic, V., Evans, L. J., Cutting, B. T., Scalzo, J., Hanusch, Y., Jones, J., Rocchetti, M., Sonter, C., Keir, M. & Rader, R. (2020). Self-compatible blueberry cultivars require fewer floral visits to maximize fruit production than a partially self-incompatible cultivar. *Journal of Applied Ecology*, *57(12)*, 2454-2462. https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2664.13751

Klatt, B. K., Holzschuh, A., Westphal, C., Clough, Y., Smit, I., Pawelzik, E. & Tscharntke, T. (2014). Bee pollination improves crop quality, shelf life and commercial value. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, *281(1775)*, 20132440. https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2013.2440

Klein, A. M., Steffan–Dewenter, I., & Tscharntke, T. (2003). Fruit set of highland coffee increases with the diversity of pollinating bees. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series B: Biological Sciences*, *270(1518)*, 955-961. https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2002.2306

Klein, A. M., Vaissière, B. E., Cane, J. H., Steffan-Dewenter, I., Cunningham, S. A., Kremen, C. & Tscharntke, T. (2007). Importance of pollinators in changing landscapes for world crops. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, *274(1608)*, 303-313. https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2006.3721

Knight, T. M., Steets, J. A., Vamosi, J. C., Mazer, S. J., Burd, M., Campbell, D. R., Dudash, M. R., Johnston, M. O., Mitchell, R. J. & Ashman, T-L. (2005). Pollen limitation of plant reproduction: pattern and process. *Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics*, 467-497. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.ecolsys.36.102403.115320

Length, R., Singmann, H., Love, J., Buerkner, P., & Herve, M. (2018). Emmeans: Estimated marginal means, aka least-squares means. *R package version*, *1(1)*, 3.

Licker, R., Johnston, M., Foley, J. A., Barford, C., Kucharik, C. J., Monfreda, C. & Ramankutty, N. (2010). Mind the gap: how do climate and agricultural management explain the 'yield gap'of croplands around the world?. *Global Ecology and Biogeography*, *19(6)*, 769-782. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1466-8238.2010.00563.x

Mallinger, R. E., Ternest, J. J., Weaver, S. A., Weaver, J., & Pryer, S. (2021). Importance of insect pollinators for Florida agriculture: a systematic review of the literature. *Florida Entomologist*, *104(3)*, 222-229. https://doi.org/10.1653/024.104.0312

Marini, L., Tamburini, G., Petrucco-Toffolo, E., Lindström, S. A., Zanetti, F., Mosca, G. & Bommarco, R. (2015). Crop management modifies the benefits of insect pollination in oilseed rape. *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment*, *207*, 61-66. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2015.03.027

Mota, L., Hevia, V., Rad, C., Alves, J., Silva, A., González, J. A., Ortega-Marcos, J., Aguado, O., Alcorlo, P., Azcárate, F., Chapinal, L., López, C., Loureiro, J., Marks, E., Siopa, C., Sousa, J. P. & Castro, S. (2022). Flower strips and remnant semi-natural vegetation have different impacts on pollination and productivity of sunflower crops. *Journal of Applied Ecology*, *59(9)*, 2386-2397. https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2664.14241

Nicholson, C. C., Koh, I., Richardson, L. L., Beauchemin, A., & Ricketts, T. H. (2017). Farm and landscape factors interact to affect the supply of pollination services. *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment*, *250*, 113-122. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2017.08.030

Olhnuud, A., Liu, Y., Makowski, D., Tscharntke, T., Westphal, C., Wu, P. Wang, M. & van der Werf, W. (2022). Pollination deficits and contributions of pollinators in apple production: A global meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Ecology*, *59(12)*, 2911-2921. https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2664.14279

Potts, S. G., Biesmeijer, J. C., Kremen, C., Neumann, P., Schweiger, O., & Kunin, W. E. (2010). Global pollinator declines: trends, impacts and drivers. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, *25(6)*, 345-353. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2010.01.007

Potts, S. G., Imperatriz-Fonseca, V., Ngo, H. T., Aizen, M. A., Biesmeijer, J. C., Breeze, T. D., Dicks, L. V., Garibaldi, L. A., Hill, R., Settele, J. & Vanbergen, A. (2016). Safeguarding pollinators and their values to human well-being. *Nature*, 540(7632), 220-229. https://doi.org/10.1038/nature20588

Potts, S. G., Ngo, H. T., Biesmeijer, J. C., Breeze, T. D., Dicks, L. V., Garibaldi, L. A., Hill, R., Settele, J. & Vanbergen, A. (2016). The assessment report of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services on pollinators, pollination, and food production. Bonn, Germany, Secretariat of the IPBES, 556pp.

Power, A. G. (2010). Ecosystem services and agriculture: tradeoffs and synergies. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, *365(1554)*, 2959-2971. https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2010.0143

Sáez, A., Aguilar, R., Ashworth, L., Gleiser, G., Morales, C. L., Traveset, A. & Aizen, M. A. (2022). Managed honeybees decrease pollination limitation in self-compatible but not in self-incompatible crops. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B*, *289(1972)*. https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2022.0086

Senapathi, D., Goddard, M. A., Kunin, W. E., & Baldock, K. C. (2017). Landscape impacts on pollinator communities in temperate systems: evidence and knowledge gaps. *Functional Ecology*, *31(1)*, 26-37. https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2435.12809

Silva, F. D. S., Carvalheiro, L. G., Aguirre-Gutiérrez, J., Lucotte, M., Guidoni-Martins, K., & Mertens, F. (2021). Virtual pollination trade uncovers global dependence on biodiversity of developing countries. *Science Advances*, *7(11)*, eabe6636. https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.abe6636

Stein, K., Coulibaly, D., Stenchly, K., Goetze, D., Porembski, S., Lindner, A., Konaté, S. & Linsenmair, E. K. (2017). Bee pollination increases yield quantity and quality of cash crops in Burkina Faso, West Africa. *Scientific Reports*, *7(1)*, 1-10. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-017-17970-2

Tamburini, G., Bommarco, R., Kleijn, D., van der Putten, W. H., & Marini, L. (2019). Pollination contribution to crop yield is often context-dependent: A review of experimental evidence. *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment*, *280*, 16-23. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2019.04.022

Toledo-Hernández, M., Wanger, T. C., & Tscharntke, T. (2017). Neglected pollinators: Can enhanced pollination services improve cocoa yields? A review. *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment*, *247*, 137-148. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2017.05.021

Vaissière, B., Freitas, B. M., & Gemmill-Herren, B. (2011). Protocol to detect and assess pollination deficits in crops: a handbook for its use. FAO, 1-81.

Von Liebig, J. (1840). Die Organische Chemie in ihre Anwendung auf Agricultur und Physiologie. Braunschweig, Germany, Vieweg und Sohn. https://doi.org/10.5962/bhl.title.42117

Webber, S. M., Garratt, M. P., Lukac, M., Bailey, A. P., Huxley, T., & Potts, S. G. (2020). Quantifying crop pollinator-dependence and pollination deficits: The effects of experimental scale on yield and quality assessments. *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment*, *304*, 107106. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2020.107106

Wesselingh, R. A. (2007). Pollen limitation meets resource allocation: towards a comprehensive methodology. *New Phytologist*, *174(1)*, 26-37. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-8137.2007.01997.x

Young, H. J., & Young, T. P. (1992). Alternative outcomes of natural and experimental high pollen loads. *Ecology*, *73(2)*, 639-647. https://doi.org/10.2307/1940770

## Figures




Figure 1. Theoretical representation of pollination components associated with yield in pollinator-dependent crops: autonomous self-pollination levels (AUTO), open levels of pollination (OPEN), and optimal pollination levels for local study conditions (OPT). Associated indexes are also presented: (1) **pollinator's contribution**, yield associated with existing pollination services; (2) **pollinator dependence**, yield directly dependent on pollinators (for simplification, here we considered a crop with negligible wind contribution for pollination) and (3) **pollen limitation**, yield loss associated with limited pollen deposition levels. See Box 1 for methodologies associated with estimations of each component and index.




657 Figure 2. a) Global distribution of data entries and studies of the analysed dataset. The colour gradient in the map area represents the total number of entries for the different regions, by ranges. Orange circles represent the total number of studies for the different regions. b) Estimated means and 95% confidence interval values for PD estimates obtained with open pollination (OPEN) and hand pollen supplementation (SUP) treatments ($\chi^2$=38.5260, $P$<0.0001). Different letters indicate significant differences at $P$<0.05. c) Scatterplot of PD values obtained through SUP treatment (y-axis) in relation to that obtained through NAT (x-axis); PD values in which PD-SUP>PD-OPEN are represented as green dots, PD-SUP<PD-OPEN are represented as yellow dots and PD-SUP=PD-OPEN are represented as black dots.




Figure 3.a) Percentage of crops along PD values (0.10 interval range). Final PD was used for each crop (values given in Table S2). Overall mean PD is indicated through a dashed line. Different colour bars represent classes as defined by Klein et al. (2007); b) Number of crops on each PD class: “little” (PD between 0-0.09), “modest” (0.10-0.39), “high” (0.40-0.89) and “essential” (0.90-1.00). Beige bars represent the crop’s distribution among classes as defined by Klein et al. (2007), and different blue bars represent crops’ distribution in this study. Classes classified as "no increase" and "unknown" in Klein et al. (2007) were excluded from our study.




Figure 4.a) Mean ± SE values of PD for each crop within the Citrus group; b) Mean ± SE values of PD for each crop within the Prunus group. Coloured points represent individual PD values, with included accessions represented by different colours. See Tables S2 and S3 for specific data regarding PD values.

## Box 1: Guidelines for pollination experiments when studying animal pollination contribution.

An experimental design should include the following treatments:


a) **pollinator exclusion:** a bagged treatment, without biotic visits. In crops also pollinated by wind, the experimental design should also evaluate its contribution using two bagging treatments, one using a mesh fabric that allows wind contribution, excluding only biotic interactions, and another using a mesh that restrains pollen movement by both wind and biotic agents. Wind contribution is given by the difference between the two bagged treatments.

b) **open pollination:** a treatment without any manipulation of the reproductive units where flowers are naturally pollinated.

c) **optimal pollination** (or pollen supplementation)**:** a treatment where flowers are naturally pollinated and to which a hand pollen supplementation is provided. Pollen applications should be performed once or multiple times, depending on the crop's requirements. The use of compatible pollen is crucial, and several sources of compatible pollen should be applied.

**Additional notes:**

- Bigger scales are preferred (i.e. branch or plant scales).
- Hand pollen supplementations without additional treatments, as bagging or emasculation, are advised but, if additional treatments are essential for the experiment, they can be considered.
- All relevant details should be provided (e.g., accession, cultivar), additionally to details surrounding agricultural management (e.g. application of reproductive hormones, presence of managed pollinators).

# Supporting information

## Contents

## Supporting Figures




**Figure S1 a)** Difference between PD values from SUP and OPEN treatments (PD-SUP – PD-OPEN) for each dataset entry; values range from -0.25 to 1.00 (differences lower than -0.25 were considered to result from methodological errors); negative differences, where PD-OPEN was the highest value, represented as yellow dots; values where PD-SUP = PD-OPEN represented by black dots; positive values, where PD-SUP was the highest value, represented as green dot. **b)** Median (solid line) and mean (blue dot) PD values for each hand pollen supplementation technique used in pollination experiments (i.e. H, Hand pollen supplementation with no additional treatments; BH, Bagging treatment + Hand pollen supplementation; EH, Emasculation treatment + Hand pollen supplementation; BEH, Bagging + Emasculation + Hand pollen supplementation). The light grey box represents 25% upper and lower quartiles. Open grey dots represent PD values of the dataset. **c)** Median (solid line) and mean (blue dot) PD values for each scale used in pollination experiments (i.e. plant, whole plant level; branch, branch level; inflor., inflorescence or cluster of flowers level; flower, individual flower level). Light grey box represents 25% upper and lower quartiles. Open grey dots represent PD values of the dataset. No significant differences (n.s.) were observed among different supplementation techniques and scales (*P* > 0.05).

## Supporting Tables

**Table S1** Information given in the dataset per entry, with description and levels, and response variables used in analyses.

| Variable type/name | Description |
| --- | --- |
| species | Crop species |
| crop | Common name of the crop |
| family | Plant family of the crop |
| plant accession | Cultivar, variety, forma, clone or any other infraspecific taxonomic level and/or subtype given in the published document |
| crop part | Economically used part of the crop (i.e. fruit or seed) |
| country | Country location of the experiment |
| year of experiment | Year in which the experiment was performed; when a range of years was given, the first indicated year is provided |
| scale | Scale level of the pollination experiment (plant, branch, inflorescence or cluster, and plant levels) |
| supplement type | Additional treatments applied to the hand supplement treatment [hand pollen supplementation using bagged and unmanipulated flowers (BH), hand pollen supplementation using open and emasculated flowers (EH), hand pollen supplementation using bagged and emasculated flowers (BEH), hand pollen supplementation using open and unmanipulated flowers (H)] |
| response variables | - PD SUP (pollinator dependence after hand pollen supplementation)<br>- PD NAT (pollinator dependence from natural pollination)<br>- PD FINAL (maximum value of pollinator dependence for a given entry) |

Table S2. Pollinator dependence values of crops. The overall mean, standard error (SE), minimum (min) and maximum (max) values of pollinator dependence are provided, along with the number of accessions with information and the number of entries for each crop. NA denotes no available information. Species highlighted in bold represent species not listed in previous compilations.

| Species | Crop common name | Number of accessions with information | Pollinator dependence value | | | | Number of entries |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | mean | SE | min | max | |
| *Abelmoschus esculentus* | Okra | 2 | 0.14 | 0.08 | 0.00 | 0.36 | 4 |
| *Acca sellowiana* | Feijoa | 7 | 0.95 | 0.03 | 0.79 | 1.00 | 7 |
| ***Actinidia chinensis*** | Golden kiwifruit | 3 | 0.73 | 0.11 | 0.47 | 0.94 | 4 |
| *Actinidia chinensis* var. *deliciosa* | Kiwifruit | 7 | 0.59 | 0.09 | 0.10 | 1.00 | 14 |
| ***Anacardium occidentale*** | Cashew | 2 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 4 |
| ***Annona cherimola*** | Cherimoya | 1 | 1.00 | NA | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1 |
| *Annona crassiflora* | Marolo | NA | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 2 |
| *Annona squamosa* | Sugar apple | NA | 1.00 | NA | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1 |
| *Annona* spp.* | Custard apple | 1 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 5 |
| *Arachis hypogea* | Peanut | 2 | 0.22 | 0.05 | 0.09 | 0.36 | 2 |
| ***Artocarpus heterophyllus*** | Jackfruit | 2 | 0.84 | 0.05 | 0.79 | 0.88 | 2 |
| *Asimina parviflora* | Pawpaw | NA | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 2 |
| *Averrhoa carambola* | Carambola | 1 | 0.93 | NA | 0.93 | 0.93 | 1 |
| *Bertholletia excelsa* | Brazil nut | NA | 1.00 | NA | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1 |
| ***Bixa orellana*** | Annatto | NA | 0.98 | NA | 0.98 | 0.98 | 1 |
| *Brassica juncea* | Mustard seed | NA | 0.40 | 0.03 | 0.34 | 0.48 | 4 |
| *Brassica napus* | Oilseed rape | 8 | 0.27 | 0.03 | 0.00 | 0.69 | 35 |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Brassica rapa* | Canola | 2 | 0.39 | 0.04 | 0.30 | 0.51 | 4 |
| *Cajanus cajan* | Pigeon pea | NA | 0.17 | 0.01 | 0.15 | 0.19 | 6 |
| ***Camellia oleifera*** | Camellia | NA | 0.87 | 0.04 | 0.81 | 0.94 | 3 |
| ***Capparis spinosa*** | Caper | NA | 0.83 | NA | 0.83 | 0.83 | 1 |
| *Capsicum annuum* | Chilli | 2 | 0.48 | 0.07 | 0.10 | 0.93 | 14 |
| *Capsicum chinense* | Habanero pepper | 1 | 0.85 | NA | 0.85 | 0.85 | 1 |
| *Carica papaya* | Papaya | 1 | 0.91 | NA | 0.91 | 0.91 | 1 |
| *Carthamus tinctorius* | Safflower | NA | 0.58 | NA | 0.58 | 0.58 | 1 |
| *Carum carvi* | Caraway seed | NA | 0.20 | NA | 0.20 | 0.20 | 1 |
| ***Castanea crenata*** | Japanese chestnut | 2 | 0.77 | 0.09 | 0.59 | 0.86 | 3 |
| ***Castanea mollissima*** | Chinese chestnut | 1 | 0.06 | 0.03 | 0.02 | 0.12 | 3 |
| *Castanea sativa* | European chestnut | 6 | 0.35 | 0.07 | 0.04 | 0.63 | 8 |
| ***Castanea sativa* × *C. crenata*** | Chestnut | 7 | 0.76 | 0.05 | 0.55 | 0.94 | 10 |
| *Cicer arietinum* | Chickpea | 1 | 0.27 | NA | 0.27 | 0.27 | 1 |
| *Citrullus lanatus* | Watermelon | 2 | 0.90 | 0.05 | 0.84 | 1.00 | 3 |
| *Citrus clementina* | Clementine | 3 | 0.82 | 0.07 | 0.67 | 1.00 | 5 |
| *Citrus limon* | Lemon | NA | 0.80 | NA | 0.80 | 0.80 | 1 |
| *Citrus paradisi* | Grapefruit | 5 | 0.67 | 0.04 | 0.53 | 1.00 | 14 |
| C. paradisi × *C. reticulata* | Tangelo | 2 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 2 |
| *Citrus reticulata* | Mandarin, tangerine | 2 | 0.67 | 0.34 | 0.33 | 1.00 | 2 |
| *Citrus sinensis* | Orange | 4 | 0.19 | 0.04 | 0.06 | 0.31 | 7 |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Cocos nucifera* | Coconut | 1 | 0.36 | NA | 0.36 | 0.36 | 1 |
| *Coffea arabica* | Arabic coffee | 2 | 0.31 | 0.05 | 0.21 | 0.37 | 3 |
| *Coffea canephora* | Coffee | NA | 0.63 | 0.32 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 3 |
| *Coriandrum sativum* | Coriander | 1 | 0.47 | 0.33 | 0.14 | 0.80 | 2 |
| *Cucumis melo* | Melon | 2 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 4 |
| *Cucumis sativus* | Cucumber | 2 | 0.56 | 0.10 | 0.26 | 0.81 | 5 |
| *Cucurbita maxima* | Pumpkin | 1 | 1.00 | NA | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1 |
| *Cucurbita moschata* | Gourd | 2 | 0.90 | 0.08 | 0.70 | 1.00 | 3 |
| *Cucurbita pepo* | Squash | 4 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 5 |
| *Cucurbita pepo* | Courgette | NA | 0.31 | 0.06 | 0.21 | 0.40 | 1 |
| *Cuminum cyminum* | Cumin | 1 | 0.29 | NA | 0.29 | 0.29 | 1 |
| ***Cydonia oblonga*** | **Quince** | **6** | **1.00** | **NA** | **1.00** | **1.00** | **11** |
| *Dimocarpus longan* | Longan | NA | 0.50 | NA | 0.50 | 0.50 | 1 |
| *Diospyros kaki* | Persimmon | 4 | 0.60 | 0.10 | 0.21 | 1.00 | 9 |
| *Durio zibethinus* | Durian | 1 | 0.92 | 0.09 | 0.83 | 1.00 | 2 |
| *Elaeis guineensis* | Oil palm | NA | 0.81 | NA | 0.81 | 0.81 | 1 |
| *Elettaria cardamomum* | Cardamom | 2 | 0.99 | 0.02 | 0.97 | 1.00 | 2 |
| *Eriobotrya japonica* | Loquat | 1 | 0.75 | 0.02 | 0.73 | 0.76 | 2 |
| ***Euterpe oleracea*** | Açaí | NA | 0.84 | NA | 0.84 | 0.84 | 1 |
| *Fagopyrum esculentum* | Buckwheat | 1 | 0.49 | NA | 0.49 | 0.49 | 1 |
| *Ficus carica* | Fig | 1 | 0.32 | NA | 0.32 | 0.32 | 1 |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Foeniculum vulgare* | Fennel | 1 | 0.87 | NA | 0.87 | 0.87 | 1 |
| *Fragaria × ananassa* | Strawberry | 2 | 0.54 | 0.09 | 0.42 | 0.74 | 3 |
| *Glycine max* | Soybean | 4 | 0.19 | 0.06 | 0.00 | 0.37 | 5 |
| *Gossypium hirsutum* | Cottonseed | 2 | 0.20 | 0.05 | 0.07 | 0.37 | 6 |
| *Helianthus annuus* | Sunflower | 7 | 0.54 | 0.09 | 0.08 | 0.93 | 8 |
| ***Jatropha curcas*** | Jatrofa | NA | 0.58 | 0.07 | 0.19 | 0.87 | 8 |
| *Linum usitatissimum* | Linseed | 1 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.00 | 0.04 | 2 |
| *Litchi chinensis* | Lychee | 9 | 0.80 | 0.08 | 0.14 | 1.00 | 15 |
| ***Lonicera caerulea*** | Honeysuckle | 2 | 0.64 | 0.02 | 0.62 | 0.65 | 2 |
| ***Luffa acutangula*** | Chinese okra | 2 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 2 |
| ***Luffa aegyptiaca*** | Smooth gourd | 4 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 4 |
| ***Macadamia* spp.***** | Macadamia | 2 | 0.66 | 0.23 | 0.07 | 1.00 | 8 |
| *Macadamia integrifolia* | Macadamia | 2 | 0.80 | 0.11 | 0.56 | 1.00 | 4 |
| ***Malpighia emarginata*** | Acerola cherry | 3 | 0.86 | 0.07 | 0.66 | 1.00 | 5 |
| *Malus domestica* | Apple | 25 | 0.73 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 1.00 | 182 |
| *Mangifera indica* | Mango | 2 | 0.71 | 0.18 | 0.53 | 0.88 | 2 |
| *Manilkara zapota* | Sapodilla | 1 | 0.90 | NA | 0.90 | 0.90 | 1 |
| ***Momordica charantia*** | Bitter melon | 2 | 0.95 | 0.05 | 0.68 | 1.00 | 7 |
| *Myristica fragrans* | Nutmeg | NA | 1.00 | NA | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1 |
| *Nephelium lappaceum* | Rambutan | 1 | 0.54 | 0.02 | 0.52 | 0.56 | 2 |
| ***Nigella sativa*** | Black cumin | NA | 0.47 | 0.01 | 0.46 | 0.47 | 2 |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Opuntia ficus-indica* | Cactus pear | 1 | 0.41 | 0.07 | 0.17 | 0.57 | 5 |
| ***Paeonia ostii*** | Peony | 1 | 0.52 | NA | 0.52 | 0.52 | 1 |
| ***Papaver somniferum*** | Poppy seed | NA | 0.41 | NA | 0.41 | 0.41 | 1 |
| *Passiflora edulis* | Passion fruit | NA | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.97 | 1.00 | 8 |
| ***Passiflora ligularis*** | Granadilla | NA | 0.99 | NA | 0.99 | 0.99 | 1 |
| *Persea americana* | Avocado | 1 | 0.86 | NA | 0.86 | 0.86 | 1 |
| *Phaseolus coccineus* | Runner bean | 4 | 0.78 | 0.08 | 0.44 | 1.00 | 8 |
| *Phaseolus vulgaris* | Bean | 3 | 0.19 | 0.11 | 0.00 | 0.37 | 2 |
| ***Physalis angulata*** | Camapu | NA | 1.00 | NA | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1 |
| ***Physalis peruviana*** | Goldenberry | NA | 0.34 | 0.02 | 0.32 | 0.35 | 2 |
| ***Pimpinella anisum*** | Anise | NA | 0.45 | 0.02 | 0.43 | 0.47 | 2 |
| ***Polaskia chichipe*** | Chichituna | NA | 0.67 | NA | 0.67 | 0.67 | 1 |
| *Prunus armeniaca* | Apricot | 1 | 0.95 | 0.04 | 0.87 | 1.00 | 3 |
| *Prunus avium* | Sweet cherry | 1 | 0.82 | 0.17 | 0.49 | 1.00 | 3 |
| *Prunus cerasus* | Sour cherry | 5 | 0.75 | 0.06 | 0.36 | 0.97 | 9 |
| *Prunus domestica* | Plum | 2 | 0.60 | 0.03 | 0.52 | 0.66 | 3 |
| *Prunus dulcis* | Almond | 13 | 0.86 | 0.03 | 0.38 | 1.00 | 23 |
| *Prunus persica* | Peach, nectarine | 43 | 0.37 | 0.03 | 0.08 | 0.73 | 43 |
| *Psidium guajava* | Guava | 1 | 0.08 | NA | 0.08 | 0.08 | 1 |
| ***Psophocarpus tetragonolobus*** | Winged bean | NA | 0.69 | NA | 0.69 | 0.69 | 1 |
| *Punica granatum* | Pomegranate | 3 | 0.40 | 0.02 | 0.37 | 0.44 | 3 |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Pyrus communis* | Pear | 6 | 0.74 | 0.10 | 0.15 | 1.00 | 8 |
| *Ribes rubrum* | Currant | 1 | 0.42 | NA | 0.42 | 0.42 | 1 |
| ***Ribes uva-crispa*** | Gooseberry | 5 | 0.45 | 0.06 | 0.27 | 0.65 | 7 |
| ***Ricinus communis*** | Castor bean | NA | 0.81 | NA | 0.81 | 0.81 | 1 |
| *Rosa multiflora* | Rose hip | 8 | 0.99 | 0.00 | 0.99 | 1.00 | 8 |
| *Rubus fruticosus* | Blackberry | 2 | 0.45 | 0.06 | 0.39 | 0.51 | 2 |
| *Rubus idaeus* | Raspberry | 5 | 0.55 | 0.07 | 0.07 | 0.70 | 8 |
| ***Selenicereus undatus*** | White-fleshed pitaya | 1 | 0.22 | NA | 0.22 | 0.22 | 1 |
| ***Selenicereus* spp.**** | Red-peel pitaya | 3 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 3 |
| *Sesamum indicum* | Sesame seed | 2 | 0.25 | 0.24 | 0.01 | 0.49 | 2 |
| *Solanum lycopersicum* | Tomato | 2 | 0.40 | 0.12 | 0.28 | 0.52 | 2 |
| *Solanum melongena* | Eggplant | 3 | 0.83 | 0.04 | 0.74 | 1.00 | 8 |
| *Solanum quitoense* | Naranjilla | NA | 1.00 | NA | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1 |
| *Spondias mombin* | Hog plum | 1 | 0.78 | NA | 0.78 | 0.78 | 1 |
| *Theobroma cacao* | Cocoa | NA | 1.00 | NA | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1 |
| ***Trichosanthes cucumerina*** | Snake gourd | 3 | 0.91 | 0.06 | 0.73 | 1.00 | 4 |
| ***Trichosanthes dioica*** | Pointed gourd | 1 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 2 |
| ***Trifolium alexandrinum*** | Berseem | NA | 0.24 | 0.04 | 0.20 | 0.27 | 2 |
| *Vaccinium corymbosum* | Highbush blueberry | 6 | 0.53 | 0.04 | 0.28 | 0.92 | 20 |
| *Vaccinium macrocarpon* | Cranberry | 1 | 0.58 | NA | 0.58 | 0.58 | 1 |
| *Vaccinium myrtillus* | Bilberry | NA | 0.93 | NA | 0.93 | 0.93 | 1 |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ***Vaccinium virgatum*** | Rabbit-eye blueberry | NA | 0.79 | 0.11 | 0.60 | 1.00 | 4 |
| ***Vaccinium vitis-idaea*** | Linganberry | NA | 0.88 | NA | 0.88 | 0.88 | 1 |
| *Vanilla planifolia*† | Vanilla | NA | 1.00 | NA | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1 |
| *Vicia faba* | Broad bean | 1 | 0.05 | 0.03 | 0.02 | 0.08 | 2 |
| *Vigna subterranea* | Bambara bean | 2 | 0.87 | 0.01 | 0.85 | 0.90 | 2 |
| *Vigna unguiculata* | Cowpea | 2 | 0.22 | 0.11 | 0.04 | 0.42 | 3 |
| *Vitellaria paradoxa* | Karite nut | 1 | 0.54 | 0.20 | 0.08 | 1.00 | 6 |
| *Ziziphus jujuba* | Jujube | NA | 0.97 | NA | 0.97 | 0.97 | 1 |

| Species | Crop common name | Number of accessions with information | **Pollinator dependence (from non quantitative data)** | | | Number of entries |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | PD | SE | obs | |
| *Arbutus unedo* | Tree-strawberry | NA | 0.25 | NA | Mean value from Klein et al. 2007 | NA |
| *Canavalia spp.* | Jack / Horse bean | NA | 0.25 | NA | Mean value from Klein et al. 2007 | NA |
| *Chrysophyllum cainito* | Star apple | NA | 0.05 | NA | Mean value from Klein et al. 2007 | NA |
| *Cola spp.* | Cola nut | NA | 0.65 | NA | Mean value from Klein et al. 2007 | NA |
| *Crataegus azarolus* | Azarole | NA | 0.05 | NA | Mean value from Klein et al. 2007 | NA |
| *Cyamopsis tetragonoloba* | Guar bean | NA | 0.05 | NA | Mean value from Klein et al. 2007 | NA |
| *Lablab purpureus* | Hyacinth bean | NA | 0.25 | NA | Mean value from Klein et al. 2007 | NA |
| *Mammea americana* | Mammee | NA | 0.25 | NA | Mean value from Klein et al. 2007 | NA |
| *Pimenta dioica* | Allspice | NA | 0.65 | NA | Mean value from Klein et al. 2007 | NA |
| *Sorbus domestica* | Service-apple | NA | 0.25 | NA | Mean value from Klein et al. 2007 | NA |
| *Tamarindus indica* | Tamarind | NA | 0.05 | NA | Mean value from Klein et al. 2007 | NA |

Notes: Our study extends the existing data; however, because we only used studies with pollination experiments, some species previously reported and for which we could not find relevant publications may be missing from our list.

**Annona* spp. includes Annona hybrids (e.g. *Annona squamosa* × *Annona cherimola*)

** *Selenicereus* spp. was not always given at the species level by included studies. Difficulties in separating species and accessions are present due to high intra- and/or inter-specific hybridization. Here, we considered two crops: *Hylocereus* spp. (including red-peel pitayas) and *Hylocereus undatus* (white-peel pitaya).

****Macadamia* spp. is adopted for studies in which species level was not given, or hybrids were studied.

ƗVanilla planifolia* was included in this list, although a complete pollination experiment was not found in the literature (due to the lack of a pollinator exclusion treatment). Once vanilla species possess a rostellum membrane that physically divides female and male flower structures, self-pollination is prevented (Rodolphe et al. 2011), and the crop depends entirely on pollinators.

**References**

Pías, B., & Guitián, P. (2006). Breeding system and pollen limitation in the masting tree Sorbus aucuparia L.(Rosaceae) in the NW Iberian Peninsula. *Acta Oecologica*, 29, 97-103.

Rani, T. S., & Solomon Raju, A. J. (2020). Reproductive ecology of nutritionally important perennial climber Canavalia gladiata (Fabaceae: Faboideae). Phytologia Balcanica, 26(1).

Rodolphe, G., Séverine, B., Michel, G., & Pascale, B. (2011). Biodiversity and evolution in the Vanilla genus. In: *The dynamical processes of biodiversity-case studies of evolution and spatial distribution*), 1-27.

Scott-Brown, A. S., Arnold, S. E., Kite, G. C., Farrell, I. W., Farman, D. I., Collins, D. W., & Stevenson, P. C. (2019). Mechanisms in mutualisms: a chemically mediated thrips pollination strategy in common elder. *Planta*, 250, 367-379.

Table S3. Pollinator dependence values of accessions for each species/crop. The mean, standard error (SE), minimum (min) and maximum (max) values of pollinator dependence, along with the total number of entries for each included accession (i.e. cultivar, variety, and other infraspecific taxonomic levels), are provided. NA denotes no available information.

| Species | Crop / Plant genotype | Pollinator dependence value: mean | SE | min | max | Number of entries |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Abelmoschus esculentus* | Okra | | | | | |
| | var. *Clemson spineless* | 0.10 | 0.02 | 0.07 | 0.12 | 2 |
| | var. *Shakthi* | 0.36 | NA | 0.36 | 0.36 | 1 |
| *Acca sellowiana* | Feijoa | | | | | |
| | clone "51" | 0.79 | NA | 0.79 | 0.79 | 1 |
| | clone "101" | 1 | NA | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| | clone "453 N.2" | 1 | NA | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| | clone "454 N.2" | 1 | NA | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| | clone "456 N.2" | 1 | NA | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| | clone "457 N.2" | 1 | NA | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| | clone "458 N.2" | 0.84 | NA | 0.84 | 0.84 | 1 |
| *Actinidia chinensis* | Golden Kiwifruit | | | | | |
| | cv. "Golden Sunshine" | 0.62 | NA | 0.62 | 0.62 | 1 |
| | cv. "Gulf Coast Gold" | 0.87 | NA | 0.87 | 0.87 | 1 |
| | cv. "Haegeum" | 0.94 | NA | 0.94 | 0.94 | 1 |
| *Actinidia chinensis* var. *deliciosa* | Kiwifruit | | | | | |
| | cv. "Allison" | 1.00 | NA | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1 |
| | cv. "BoErica" | 0.61 | NA | 0.61 | 0.61 | 1 |
| | cv. "Bruno" | 1.00 | NA | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1 |
| | cv. "Early Green" | 0.25 | NA | 0.25 | 0.25 | 1 |
| | cv. "Hayward" | 0.50 | 0.11 | 0.10 | 1.00 | 8 |
| | cv. "Monty" | 1.00 | NA | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1 |
| | cv. "Tsechelidis" | 0.41 | NA | 0.41 | 0.41 | 1 |
| *Anacardium occidentale* | Cashew | | | | | |
| | cv. "CCP 1001" | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 2 |
| | cv. "CCP76" | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 2 |
| *Annona* sp. | Custard Apple | | | | | |
| | cv. "Hillary White" | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 5 |
| *Annona cherimola* | Cherimoya | | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | cv. “Big Sister” | 1.00 | NA | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1 |
| *Arachis hypogea* | Peanut | | | | | |
| | var. *Early Runner* | 0.36 | NA | 0.36 | 0.36 | 1 |
| | var. *SO95R* | 0.09 | NA | 0.09 | 0.09 | 1 |
| *Artocarpus heterophyllus* | Jackfruit | | | | | |
| | cv. “Chee” | 0.79 | NA | 0.79 | 0.79 | 1 |
| | cv. “Dang Rasimi” | 0.88 | NA | 0.88 | 0.88 | 1 |
| *Averrhoa carambola* | Carambola | | | | | |
| | cv. “Mih Tao” | 0.93 | NA | 0.93 | 0.93 | 1 |
| *Brassica napus* | Oilseed rape | | | | | |
| | cv. “CTC-4” | 0.16 | NA | 0.16 | 0.16 | 1 |
| | cv. “DK Exquisite” | 0.12 | NA | 0.12 | 0.12 | 1 |
| | cv. “Hyola 420” | 0.20 | NA | 0.20 | 0.20 | 1 |
| | cv. “Hyola 61” | 0.42 | 0.21 | 0.21 | 0.62 | 2 |
| | cv. “Sherlock” | 0.24 | NA | 0.24 | 0.24 | 1 |
| | cv. “Traviata” | 0.25 | NA | 0.25 | 0.25 | 1 |
| | cv. “Treffer” | 0.42 | NA | 0.42 | 0.42 | 1 |
| | cv. “Visby” | 0.36 | NA | 0.36 | 0.36 | 1 |
| *Brassica rapa* | Canola | | | | | |
| | cv. “Arlo” | 0.38 | NA | 0.38 | 0.38 | 1 |
| | cv. “Pragati” | 0.37 | NA | 0.37 | 0.37 | 1 |
| *Capsicum annuum* | Chilli | | | | | |
| | cv. “All Big” | 0.10 | NA | 0.10 | 0.10 | 1 |
| | var. *Samn* | 0.4 | NA | 0.4 | 0.4 | 1 |
| *Capsicum chinense* | Habanero pepper | | | | | |
| | cv. “Habanero” | 0.85 | NA | 0.85 | 0.85 | 1 |
| *Carica papaya* | Papaya | | | | | |
| | cv. “Maradol” | 0.91 | NA | 0.91 | 0.91 | 1 |
| *Castanea crenata* | Japanese chestnut | | | | | |
| | cv. “Ishizuki” | 0.73 | 0.14 | 0.59 | 0.86 | 2 |
| | cv. “Tsukuba” | 0.85 | NA | 0.85 | 0.85 | 1 |
| *Castanea mollissima* | Chinese chestnut | | | | | |
| | cv. “Zaodali” | 0.06 | 0.03 | 0.02 | 0.12 | 3 |
| *Castanea sativa* | European chestnut | | | | | |
| | cv. “Judia” | 0.40 | NA | 0.40 | 0.40 | 1 |
| | cv. “Longal” | 0.19 | 0.15 | 0.04 | 0.34 | 2 |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | cv. “Marillac” | 0.63 | NA | 0.63 | 0.63 | 1 |
| | cv. “Marrone di Lusern” | 0.39 | NA | 0.39 | 0.39 | 1 |
| | cv. “Martainha” | 0.45 | 0.04 | 0.41 | 0.49 | 2 |
| | cv. “Verdeal” | 0.08 | NA | 0.08 | 0.08 | 1 |
| *Castanea sativa × C. crenata* | Chestnut | | | | | |
| | cv. “Bellefer” | 0.72 | NA | 0.72 | 0.72 | 1 |
| | cv. “Betizac” | 0.86 | NA | 0.86 | 0.86 | 1 |
| | cv. “Florifer” | 0.55 | NA | 0.55 | 0.55 | 1 |
| | cv. “Maraval” | 0.60 | NA | 0.60 | 0.60 | 1 |
| | cv. “Marigoule” | 0.85 | 0.07 | 0.64 | 0.94 | 4 |
| | cv. “OG19” | 0.64 | NA | 0.64 | 0.64 | 1 |
| | cv. “Vignols” | 0.79 | NA | 0.79 | 0.79 | 1 |
| *Cicer arietinum* | Chickpea | | | | | |
| | cv. “Desi” | 0.27 | NA | 0.27 | 0.27 | 1 |
| *Citrullus lanatus* | Watermelon | | | | | |
| | cv. “Malali” | 0.87 | NA | 0.87 | 0.87 | 1 |
| | cv. “Samara F1” | 0.84 | NA | 0.84 | 0.84 | 1 |
| *Citrus clementina* | Clementine | | | | | |
| | cv. “Afourer” | 0.67 | NA | 0.67 | 0.67 | 1 |
| | cv. “Fi Sodea” | 0.97 | NA | 0.97 | 0.97 | 1 |
| | cv. “Nules” | 1.00 | NA | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1 |
| *Citrus paradisi* | Grapefruit | | | | | |
| | cv. “Franks” | 0.95 | NA | 0.95 | 0.95 | 1 |
| | cv. “Mcgain”s” | 1.00 | NA | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1 |
| | cv. “Minneola” | 0.58 | 0.01 | 0.53 | 0.62 | 11 |
| | cv. “Rio Red” | 0.94 | NA | 0.94 | 0.94 | 1 |
| | cv. “Rouge la Toma” | 0.79 | NA | 0.79 | 0.79 | 1 |
| *C. paradisi × C. reticulata* | Tangelo | | | | | |
| | cv. “Lee” | 1.00 | NA | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1 |
| | cv. “Nova” | 1.00 | NA | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1 |
| *Citrus reticulata* | Mandarin, tangerine | | | | | |
| | cv. “Criolla” | 0.33 | NA | 0.33 | 0.33 | 1 |
| | cv. “Fairchild” | 1.00 | NA | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1 |
| *Citrus sinensis* | Orange | | | | | |
| | cv. “Early Gold” | 0.15 | 0.05 | 0.09 | 0.20 | 2 |
| | var. “Pera ro” | 0.06 | NA | 0.06 | 0.06 | 1 |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | cv. “Rhod-e-Red” | 0.21 | 0.07 | 0.14 | 0.28 | 2 |
| | cv. “Trovita” | 0.30 | 0.02 | 0.28 | 0.31 | 2 |
| *Cocos nucifera* | Coconut | | | | | |
| | cv. “Pacific Tall 1” | 0.36 | NA | 0.36 | 0.36 | 1 |
| *Coffea arabica* | Arabic Coffee | | | | | |
| | cv. “Maragogipe” | 0.21 | NA | 0.21 | 0.21 | 1 |
| | cv. “Mundo Novo” | 0.37 | NA | 0.37 | 0.37 | 1 |
| *Coriandrum sativum* | Coriander | | | | | |
| | cv. “Waltahi” | 0.14 | NA | 0.14 | 0.14 | 1 |
| *Cucumis melo* | Melon | | | | | |
| | var. *agrestis* | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 2 |
| | cv. “HM-43” | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 2 |
| *Cucumis sativus* | Cucumber | | | | | |
| | var. *Ashley* | 0.52 | 0.10 | 0.42 | 0.62 | 2 |
| | cv. “Swam Ageti” | 0.81 | NA | 0.81 | 0.81 | 1 |
| *Cucurbita maxima* | Pumpkin | | | | | |
| | var. *Golden Delicious* | 1.00 | NA | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1 |
| *Cucurbita moschata* | Gourd | | | | | |
| | var. J*acarezinho* | 1.00 | NA | | | 1 |
| | cv. “Meni Brasileira” | 1.00 | NA | | | 1 |
| *Cucurbita pepo* | Squash | | | | | |
| | cv. “Chamatkar” | 1.00 | NA | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1 |
| | cv. “Chandra” | 1.00 | NA | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1 |
| | cv. “Gold Queen” | 1.00 | NA | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1 |
| | cv. “Parikrama” | 1.00 | NA | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1 |
| *Cucurbita pepo* | Courgette | | | | | |
| | var. *Tosca* | 0.31 | 0.06 | 0.21 | 0.4 | 2 |
| *Cuminum cyminum* | Cumin | | | | | |
| | var. *GC-4* | 0.29 | NA | 0.29 | 0.29 | 1 |
| *Cydonia oblonga* | Quince | | | | | |
| | cv. “Agersi” | 1.00 | NA | 1.00 | 1.00 | 2 |
| | cv. “Bereczki” | 1.00 | NA | 1.00 | 1.00 | 2 |
| | cv. “Bereczki botermo” | 1.00 | NA | 1.00 | 1.00 | 2 |
| | cv. “Champion” | 1.00 | NA | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1 |
| | cv. “Konstantinápolyi” | 1.00 | NA | 1.00 | 1.00 | 2 |
| | cv. “Mezotúri” | 1.00 | NA | 1.00 | 1.00 | 2 |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Diospyros kaki* | Persimmon | | | | | |
| | cv. “Fuyu” | 0.42 | 0.05 | 0.21 | 0.56 | 5 |
| | cv. “Giant Fuyu” | 1.00 | NA | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1 |
| | cv. “O”Gosho” | 1.00 | NA | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1 |
| | cv. “Tabebashi” | 0.39 | NA | 0.39 | 0.39 | 1 |
| *Durio zibethinus* | Durian | | | | | |
| | cv. “Monthong” | 1.00 | NA | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1 |
| *Elettaria cardamomum* | Cardamom | | | | | |
| | cv. “Malabar” | 0.97 | NA | 0.97 | 0.97 | 1 |
| | cv. “Njellani” | 1.00 | NA | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1 |
| *Eriobotrya japonica* | Loquat | | | | | |
| | cv. “Akko13” | 0.75 | 0.02 | 0.73 | 0.76 | 2 |
| *Fagopyrum esculentum* | Buckwheat | | | | | |
| | cv. “Manor” | 0.49 | NA | 0.49 | 0.49 | 1 |
| *Ficus carica* | Fig | | | | | |
| | var. *Nabout* | 0.32 | NA | 0.32 | 0.32 | 1 |
| *Foeniculum vulgare* | Fennel | | | | | |
| | var. *Jupiter* | 0.87 | NA | 0.87 | 0.87 | 1 |
| *Fragaria × ananassa* | Strawberry | | | | | |
| | cv. “Honeoye” | 0.42 | NA | 0.42 | 0.42 | 1 |
| | var. *Jewel* | 0.60 | 0.11 | 0.49 | 0.71 | 2 |
| *Glycine max* | Soybean | | | | | |
| | var. *BRS-113* | 0.37 | NA | 0.37 | 0.37 | 1 |
| | cv. “BRS Carnaúba” | 0.06 | NA | 0.06 | 0.06 | 1 |
| | var. *IRAT 278* | 0.27 | 0.01 | 0.26 | 0.28 | 2 |
| | var. *Nidera A 4990 RG* | 0.08 | 0.08 | 0.00 | 0.15 | 2 |
| *Gossypium hirsutum* | Cottonseed | | | | | |
| | cv. “CNPA-7MH” | 0.27 | NA | 0.27 | 0.27 | 1 |
| | var. *FK37* | 0.37 | NA | 0.37 | 0.37 | 1 |
| *Helianthus annuus* | Sunflower | | | | | |
| | clone NDSH-1 | 0.53 | NA | 0.53 | 0.53 | 1 |
| | cv. “5009” | 0.48 | NA | 0.48 | 0.48 | 1 |
| | cv. “9530” | 0.08 | NA | 0.08 | 0.08 | 1 |
| | cv. “9592” | 0.54 | NA | 0.54 | 0.54 | 1 |
| | cv. “Hysun 30” | 0.93 | NA | 0.93 | 0.93 | 1 |
| | cv. “Jaguar II” | 0.31 | NA | 0.31 | 0.31 | 1 |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | cv. “Royal Hybrid 843” | 0.61 | NA | 0.61 | 0.61 | 1 |
| *Hylocereus undatus* | White-fleshed pitaya | | | | | |
| | cv. “VN White” | 0.22 | NA | 0.22 | 0.22 | 1 |
| *Hylocereus* spp. | Red-peel pitaya | | | | | |
| | cv. “Chaozhou 5” | 1.00 | NA | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1 |
| | cv. “F11” | 1.00 | NA | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1 |
| | cv. “Orejona” | 1.00 | NA | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1 |
| *Linum usitatissimum* | Linseed | | | | | |
| | cv. “Antares” | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.00 | 0.04 | 2 |
| *Litchi chinensis* | Lychee | | | | | |
| | cv. “Ajhauli” | 0.39 | NA | 0.39 | 0.39 | 1 |
| | cv. “Dehradoon” | 0.14 | NA | 0.14 | 0.14 | 1 |
| | cv. “Dehra Rose” | 1.00 | NA | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1 |
| | cv. “Deshi” | 1.00 | NA | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1 |
| | cv. “Ellaichi” | 1.00 | NA | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1 |
| | cv. “Late Large Red” | 1.00 | NA | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1 |
| | cv. “Rose Scented” | 0.17 | NA | 0.17 | 0.17 | 1 |
| | cv. “Shahi” | 0.78 | 0.22 | 0.56 | 1.00 | 2 |
| | cv. “Trikolia” | 1.00 | NA | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1 |
| *Lonicera caerulea* | Honeysuckle | | | | | |
| | cv. “Gerda” | 0.65 | NA | 0.65 | 0.65 | 1 |
| | cv. “Viola” | 0.62 | NA | 0.62 | 0.62 | 1 |
| *Luffa acutangula* | Chinese Okra | | | | | |
| | cv. “Arka sujath” | 1.00 | NA | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1 |
| | cv. “Arka sumeet” | 1.00 | NA | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1 |
| *Luffa aegyptiaca* | Smoth gourd | | | | | |
| | cv. “C-2016” | 1.00 | NA | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1 |
| | cv. “Hirat” | 1.00 | NA | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1 |
| | cv. “Pusa Chickni” | 1.00 | NA | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1 |
| | cv. “Ragini” | 1.00 | NA | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1 |
| *Macadamia spp.* | Macadamia | | | | | |
| | cv. “246” | 0.69 | 0.20 | 0.69 | 0.69 | 4 |
| | cv. “A4” | 0.82 | 0.20 | 0.82 | 0.82 | 3 |
| *Macadamia integrifolia* | Macadamia | | | | | |
| | cv. “741” | 0.97 | NA | 0.97 | 0.97 | 1 |
| | cv. “A268” | 1.00 | NA | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1 |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Malpighia emarginata* | Acerola cherry | | | | | |
| | cv. “Flor Branca” | 0.66 | NA | 0.66 | 0.66 | 1 |
| | cv. “Okiwa” | 0.74 | NA | 0.74 | 0.74 | 1 |
| | cv. “Sertaneja” | 0.88 | NA | 0.88 | 0.88 | 1 |
| *Malus domestica* | Apple | | | | | |
| | cv. “Amanda” | 0.82 | 0.06 | 0.76 | 0.88 | 2 |
| | cv. “Aport” | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 2 |
| | cv. “Aroma” | 0.51 | 0.06 | 0.27 | 1.00 | 16 |
| | cv. “Boskoop” | 1.00 | NA | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1 |
| | cv. “Braeburn” | 0.75 | 0.05 | 0.36 | 1.00 | 21 |
| | cv. “Bramley” | 0.58 | 0.13 | 0.41 | 0.96 | 4 |
| | cv. “Cox” | 0.46 | 0.06 | 0.15 | 1.00 | 11 |
| | cv. “Elstar” | 0.65 | 0.12 | 0.15 | 1.00 | 8 |
| | cv. “Fuji” | 0.51 | NA | 0.51 | 0.51 | 1 |
| | cv. “Gala” | 0.56 | 0.03 | 0.23 | 1.00 | 39 |
| | cv. “Gilly” | 0.86 | 0.04 | 0.82 | 0.90 | 2 |
| | cv. “Golden” | 0.89 | 0.03 | 0.34 | 1.00 | 26 |
| | cv. “Hastings” | 0.85 | 0.04 | 0.76 | 0.97 | 4 |
| | cv. “Idared” | 0.56 | 0.16 | 0.40 | 0.71 | 2 |
| | cv. “Ingrid-Marie” | 1.00 | NA | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1 |
| | cv. “Jogold” | 0.72 | 0.10 | 0.60 | 0.91 | 3 |
| | cv. “Kandil” | 1.00 | NA | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1 |
| | cv. “Kirgizski zimni” | 1.00 | NA | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1 |
| | cv. “Iivka” | 0.40 | NA | 0.40 | 0.40 | 1 |
| | cv. “Montuan” | 1.00 | NA | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1 |
| | cv. “Pink Lady” | 0.99 | 0.01 | 0.97 | 1.00 | 5 |
| | cv. “Renet zolotoi” | 1.00 | NA | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1 |
| | cv. “Rubinola” | 0.84 | NA | 0.84 | 0.84 | 1 |
| | cv. “Starkrimson” | 1.00 | NA | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1 |
| | cv. “Topaz” | 0.97 | 0.03 | 0.94 | 1.00 | 2 |
| *Mangifera indica* | Mango | | | | | |
| | cv. “Chok An” | 0.88 | NA | 0.88 | 0.88 | 1 |
| | cv. “Sala” | 0.53 | NA | 0.53 | 0.53 | 1 |
| *Manilkara achras* | Sapodilla | | | | | |
| | cv. “Jantung” | 0.90 | NA | 0.90 | 0.90 | 1 |
| *Momordica charantia* | Bitter melon | | | | | |
| | var. *neelam 105* | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 3 |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | var. *raja* | 1.00 | NA | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1 |
| *Nephelium lappaceum* | Rambutan | | | | | |
| | var. "CERI61" | 0.54 | 0.02 | 0.52 | 0.56 | 2 |
| *Opuntia ficus-indica* | Cactus pear | | | | | |
| | cv. "Gialla" | 0.41 | 0.07 | 0.17 | 0.57 | 5 |
| *Paeonia ostii* | Peony | | | | | |
| | cv. "Feng Dan" | 0.52 | NA | 0.52 | 0.52 | 1 |
| *Persea americana* | Avocado | | | | | |
| | cv. "West Indian" | 0.86 | NA | 0.86 | 0.86 | 1 |
| *Phaseolus coccineus* | Runner bean | | | | | |
| | cv. "Achievement" | 0.67 | 0.12 | 0.56 | 0.79 | 2 |
| | cv. "Bianco di Spagna" | 0.71 | 0.27 | 0.44 | 0.97 | 2 |
| | cv. "Kelvedon Marvel" | 0.95 | 0.03 | 0.90 | 1.00 | 3 |
| | cv. "Streamline" | 0.61 | NA | 0.61 | 0.61 | 1 |
| *Phaseolus vulgaris* | Bean | | | | | |
| | cv. "Kariasii" | 0.19 | NA | 0.19 | 0.19 | 1 |
| | cv. "Lyamungo 90" | 0.00 | NA | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1 |
| | cv. "Processor" | 0.37 | NA | 0.37 | 0.37 | 1 |
| *Prunus armeniaca* | Apricot | | | | | |
| | cv. "Sundrop" | 0.95 | 0.04 | 0.87 | 1.00 | 3 |
| *Prunus avium* | Sweet cherry | | | | | |
| | cv. "Royal Ann" | 0.49 | NA | 0.49 | 0.49 | 1 |
| *Prunus cerasus* | Sour cherry | | | | | |
| | cv. "Csengodi" | 0.87 | 0.01 | 0.86 | 0.87 | 2 |
| | cv. "Eva" | 0.83 | 0.02 | 0.81 | 0.84 | 2 |
| | cv. "Pandy 279" | 0.97 | NA | 0.97 | 0.97 | 1 |
| | cv. "Petri" | 0.55 | 0.19 | 0.36 | 0.73 | 2 |
| | cv. "Ujfehertoi furtos" | 0.67 | 0.03 | 0.64 | 0.70 | 2 |
| *Prunus domestica* | Plum | | | | | |
| | cv. "Purple Damas" | 0.66 | 1.00 | 0.66 | 0.66 | 1 |
| | cv. 'Yellow Damas" | 0.58 | 1.00 | 0.58 | 0.58 | 1 |
| *Prunus dulcis* | Almond | | | | | |
| | cv. "Guara" | 0.85 | NA | 0.85 | 0.85 | 1 |
| | cv. "Nonpareil" | 0.95 | NA | 0.95 | 0.95 | 1 |
| | selection "A-10-2" | 0.91 | 0.05 | 0.86 | 0.95 | 2 |
| | selection "A-10-6" | 0.99 | 0.00 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 2 |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | selection "B-4-2" | 0.72 | NA | 0.72 | 0.72 | 1 |
| | selection "B-5-2" | 1.00 | 0.01 | 0.99 | 1.00 | 2 |
| | selection "B-5-9" | 0.98 | 0.01 | 0.97 | 0.98 | 2 |
| | selection "C-11-1" | 1.00 | 0.01 | 0.99 | 1.00 | 2 |
| | selection "D-3-5" | 0.59 | NA | 0.59 | 0.59 | 1 |
| | selection "D-4-15" | 0.99 | 0.02 | 0.97 | 1.00 | 2 |
| | selection "E-5-7" | 0.38 | NA | 0.38 | 0.38 | 1 |
| | selection "G-5-2" | 0.70 | 0.02 | 0.66 | 0.72 | 3 |
| | selection "A-10-8" | 0.80 | 0.02 | 0.78 | 0.81 | 2 |
| *Prunus persica* | Peach, nectarine | | | | | |
| | cv. "Aurora 1" | 0.11 | NA | 0.11 | 0.11 | 1 |
| | var. *Baby Gold 5* | 0.48 | NA | 0.48 | 0.48 | 1 |
| | var. *Baby Gold 6* | 0.53 | NA | 0.53 | 0.53 | 1 |
| | var. *Baby Gold 7* | 0.34 | NA | 0.34 | 0.34 | 1 |
| | var. *Blazing Gold* | 0.08 | NA | 0.08 | 0.08 | 1 |
| | var. *Champion* | 0.21 | NA | 0.21 | 0.21 | 1 |
| | var. *Dixired* | 0.47 | NA | 0.47 | 0.47 | 1 |
| | var. *Early Redhaven* | 0.09 | NA | 0.09 | 0.09 | 1 |
| | var. *Elberta* | 0.14 | NA | 0.14 | 0.14 | 1 |
| | var. *Flavortop* | 0.53 | NA | 0.53 | 0.53 | 1 |
| | var. *Frederica* | 0.41 | NA | 0.41 | 0.41 | 1 |
| | var. *Fusador* | 0.56 | NA | 0.56 | 0.56 | 1 |
| | cv. "Golden Queen" | 0.23 | NA | 0.23 | 0.23 | 1 |
| | var. *Hale Haven* | 0.43 | NA | 0.43 | 0.43 | 1 |
| | var. *Independence* | 0.62 | NA | 0.62 | 0.62 | 1 |
| | var. *J.H. Hale* | 0.73 | NA | 0.73 | 0.73 | 1 |
| | var. *Jerseyland* | 0.08 | NA | 0.08 | 0.08 | 1 |
| | var. *La Fayette* | 0.24 | NA | 0.24 | 0.24 | 1 |
| | var. *Lexington* | 0.40 | NA | 0.40 | 0.40 | 1 |
| | var. *Loadel* | 0.38 | NA | 0.38 | 0.38 | 1 |
| | var. *Merril Sundance* | 0.46 | NA | 0.46 | 0.46 | 1 |
| | var. *Michelini* | 0.31 | NA | 0.31 | 0.31 | 1 |
| | var. *Morton* | 0.53 | NA | 0.53 | 0.53 | 1 |
| | var. *Nectaheart* | 0.50 | NA | 0.50 | 0.50 | 1 |
| | var. *Nectared 4* | 0.37 | NA | 0.37 | 0.37 | 1 |
| | var. *Nectared 6* | 0.13 | NA | 0.13 | 0.13 | 1 |
| | var. *Nectarose* | 0.38 | NA | 0.38 | 0.38 | 1 |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | var. *Pocahontas* | 0.32 | NA | 0.32 | 0.32 | 1 |
| | var. *Red June* | 0.43 | NA | 0.43 | 0.43 | 1 |
| | var. *Redchief* | 0.28 | NA | 0.28 | 0.28 | 1 |
| | var. *Redhaven* | 0.48 | NA | 0.48 | 0.48 | 1 |
| | var. *Redtop* | 0.54 | NA | 0.54 | 0.54 | 1 |
| | var. *Redwing* | 0.53 | NA | 0.53 | 0.53 | 1 |
| | var. *Robin* | 0.59 | NA | 0.59 | 0.59 | 1 |
| | var. *Shasta* | 0.39 | NA | 0.39 | 0.39 | 1 |
| | var. *Springcrest* | 0.36 | NA | 0.36 | 0.36 | 1 |
| | var. *Springgold* | 0.53 | NA | 0.53 | 0.53 | 1 |
| | var. *Springtime* | 0.58 | NA | 0.58 | 0.58 | 1 |
| | var. *Starking Delicious* | 0.25 | NA | 0.25 | 0.25 | 1 |
| | var. *Sudanell* | 0.10 | NA | 0.10 | 0.10 | 1 |
| | var. *Suncrest* | 0.15 | NA | 0.15 | 0.15 | 1 |
| | var. *Troubador* | 0.34 | NA | 0.34 | 0.34 | 1 |
| | var. *Vesuvio* | 0.16 | NA | 0.16 | 0.16 | 1 |
| *Psidium guajava* | Guava | | | | | |
| | cv. “Kimju guava” | 0.08 | NA | 0.08 | 0.08 | 1 |
| *Punica granatum* | Pomegranate | | | | | |
| | cv. “Gorch-e-dadashi” | 0.39 | NA | 0.39 | 0.39 | 1 |
| | cv. “Poost ghermez-e-aliaghaei” | 0.37 | NA | 0.37 | 0.37 | 1 |
| | cv. “Zagh-e-yazdi” | 0.44 | NA | 0.44 | 0.44 | 1 |
| *Pyrus communis* | Pear | | | | | |
| | cv. “Conference” | 0.56 | 0.42 | 0.15 | 0.98 | 2 |
| | cv. “Rocha” | 0.96 | 0.04 | 0.92 | 0.99 | 2 |
| | cv. “Sebri” | 0.61 | NA | 0.61 | 0.61 | 1 |
| | cv. “Shahmiveh” | 0.69 | NA | 0.69 | 0.69 | 1 |
| | cv. “Tanzi” | 0.57 | NA | 0.57 | 0.57 | 1 |
| *Ribes uva-crispa* | | | | | | |
| | cv. “White Triumph” | 0.27 | NA | 0.27 | 0.27 | 1 |
| | cv. “Lady Delamere” | 0.27 | NA | 0.27 | 0.27 | 1 |
| | cv. “Resistenta” | 0.65 | NA | 0.65 | 0.65 | 1 |
| | cv. “Shanon” | 0.36 | NA | 0.36 | 0.36 | 1 |
| | cv. “ Careless” | 0.45 | 0.07 | 0.35 | 0.64 | 3 |
| *Ribes rubrum* | Currant | | | | | |
| | cv. “Rovada” | 0.42 | NA | 0.42 | 0.42 | 1 |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Rosa multiflora* | Rose hip | | | | | |
| | clone “5548” | 1.00 | NA | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1 |
| | clone “5678” | 1.00 | NA | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1 |
| | clone “5679” | 1.00 | NA | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1 |
| | clone “9246” | 0.99 | NA | 0.99 | 0.99 | 1 |
| | clone “9247” | 0.99 | NA | 0.99 | 0.99 | 1 |
| | clone “9248” | 1.00 | NA | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1 |
| | clone “9249” | 1.00 | NA | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1 |
| | clone “9257” | 1.00 | NA | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1 |
| *Rubus fruticosus* | Blackberry | | | | | |
| | cv. “Black Satin” | 0.51 | NA | 0.51 | 0.51 | 1 |
| | cv. “Hull Thornless” | 0.39 | NA | 0.39 | 0.39 | 1 |
| *Rubus idaeus* | Raspberry | | | | | |
| | cv. “Cowichan” | 0.69 | 0.01 | 0.69 | 0.69 | 1 |
| | cv. “La Amelia” | 0.07 | NA | 0.07 | 0.07 | 1 |
| | cv. “Latham” | 0.66 | 0.01 | 0.65 | 0.66 | 2 |
| | cv. “Polka” | 0.59 | NA | 0.59 | 0.59 | 1 |
| | cv. “Royalty” | 0.57 | 0.07 | 0.45 | 0.70 | 3 |
| *Selenicereus undatus* | White-fleshed pitaya | | | | | |
| | cv. “VN White” | 0.22 | NA | 0.22 | 0.22 | 1 |
| *Selenicereus* spp. | Red-peel pitaya | | | | | |
| | cv. “Chaozhou 5” | 1.00 | NA | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1 |
| | cv. “F11” | 1.00 | NA | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1 |
| | cv. “Orejona” | 1.00 | NA | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1 |
| *Sesamum indicum* | Sesame seed | | | | | |
| | cv. “CNP G2” | 0.01 | NA | 0.01 | 0.01 | 1 |
| | var. *S-42* | 0.49 | NA | 0.49 | 0.49 | 1 |
| *Solanum lycopersicum* | Tomato | | | | | |
| | var. *NS 25* | 0.52 | NA | 0.52 | 0.52 | 1 |
| | var. *SunGold* | 0.28 | NA | 0.28 | 0.28 | 1 |
| *Solanum melongena* | Eggplant | | | | | |
| | var. *Aruki 25* | 0.78 | NA | 0.78 | 0.78 | 1 |
| | var. *Kathri 25* | 0.76 | NA | 0.76 | 0.76 | 1 |
| | cv. “Poli” | 0.87 | 0.07 | 0.74 | 1.00 | 4 |
| | var. *Shiva* | 0.81 | 0.03 | 0.77 | 0.88 | 3 |
| *Spondias mombin* | Hog plum | | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | cv. “Lagoa Redonda” | 0.78 | NA | 0.78 | 0.78 | 1 |
| *Trichosanthes cucumerina* | Snake gourd | | | | | |
| | var. *Bhuvan* | 0.92 | NA | 0.92 | 0.92 | 1 |
| | var. *Lakshmi 7* | 0.73 | NA | 0.73 | 0.73 | 1 |
| | var. *S25* | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 2 |
| *Trichosanthes dioica* | Pointed gourd | | | | | |
| | cv. “Damodar” | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 2 |
| *Vaccinium corymbosum* | Highbush blueberry | | | | | |
| | cv. “Bluecrop” | 0.47 | 0.07 | 0.33 | 0.64 | 5 |
| | cv. “Duke” | 0.46 | 0.12 | 0.34 | 0.58 | 2 |
| | cv. “Emerald” | 0.76 | NA | 0.76 | 0.76 | 1 |
| | cv. “Liberty” | 0.53 | 0.07 | 0.34 | 0.80 | 6 |
| | cv. “Northland” | 0.66 | 0.05 | 0.61 | 0.70 | 2 |
| | cv. “Patriot” | 0.31 | 0.03 | 0.28 | 0.33 | 2 |
| *Vaccinium macrocarpon* | Cranberry | | | | | |
| | cv. “Stevens” | 0.58 | NA | 0.58 | 0.58 | 1 |
| *Vicia faba* | Broad bean | | | | | |
| | cv. “Tiffany” | 0.05 | 0.03 | 0.02 | 0.08 | 2 |
| *Vigna subterranea* | Bambara bean | | | | | |
| | var. *Local Cream* | 0.90 | NA | 0.90 | 0.90 | 1 |
| | var. *Local Red* | 0.85 | NA | 0.90 | 0.85 | 1 |
| *Vigna unguiculata* | Cowpea | | | | | |
| | cv. “BR3-Tracuateua” | 0.04 | NA | 0.04 | 0.04 | 1 |
| | cv. “Ken Kunde” | 0.32 | 0.10 | 0.21 | 0.42 | 2 |
| *Vitellaria paradoxa* | Karite nut | | | | | |
| | subs. *paradoxa* | 0.31 | 0.22 | 0.08 | 0.96 | 4 |

**Table S4** Information regarding the number of studies that are articles, reports, conference articles, posters and thesis, from a total of 165 studies included in the statistical analyses. The same information is also provided for 64 additional studies used for PD calculation only.

Studies used in statistical analyses

| Study type | Number of studies |
|---|---|
| Article | 136 |
| Report | 2 |
| Conference article | 5 |
| Poster | 1 |
| Thesis | 20 |
| Dataset | 1 |

Additional studies for PD calculation

| Study type | Number of studies |
|---|---|
| Article | 52 |
| Report | 1 |
| Conference article | 9 |
| Thesis | 2 |

**Table S5** Results of ANOVAs for the effect of treatment (natural pollination, PD NAT, or hand pollen supplementation, PD SUP), supplement type and scale on pollinator dependence values. Model coefficients were obtained through GLMMs using gaussian distribution and logit function transformation with an adjusted factor of 0.01.

| Fixed Factor | response variable | Chisq | df | Pr(>Chisq) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Treatment | PD NAT; PD SUP | 38.5260 | 2 | 4.3080e-09 |
| Supplement type | PD SUP | 4.6863 | 3 | 0.1963 |
| Scale | PD SUP | 8.0840 | 3 | 0.0443 |

**Table S6** Post-hoc tests for differences between different methodologies used in hand pollen supplementation on pollination experiments (i.e. H, Hand pollen supplementation with no additional treatments; BH, Bagging treatment + Hand pollen supplementation; EH, Emasculation treatment + Hand pollen supplementation; BEH, Bagging + Emasculation + Hand pollen supplementation), with estimate difference, SE value, df, t ratio and *P*-value for each comparison.

| Comparison | estimate | SE | df | t ratio | *P*-value |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| H – BEH | -0.373 | 0.470 | 153 | -0.792 | 0.8580 |
| H – BH | 0.321 | 0.351 | 140 | 0.915 | 0.7969 |
| H – EH | 1.036 | 0.670 | 142 | 1.546 | 0.4129 |
| BEH – BH | 0.694 | 0.501 | 169 | 1.384 | 0.5112 |
| BEH – EH | 1.409 | 0.736 | 142 | 1.915 | 0.2263 |
| BH – EH | 0.715 | 0.685 | 143 | 1.043 | 0.7242 |

**Table S7** Post-hoc tests for differences between experimental scales on pollination experiments, with estimate difference, SE value, df, t ratio and *P*-value for each comparison.

| Comparison | estimate | SE | df | t ratio | *P*-value |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Flower – Inflorescence | 1.244 | 0.514 | 203 | 2.422 | 0.0762 |
| Flower – Branch | 0.644 | 0.589 | 136 | 1.093 | 0.6941 |
| Flower – Plant | 0.848 | 0.423 | 145 | 2.005 | 0.1910 |
| Inflorescence – Plant | -0.396 | 0.561 | 171 | -0.706 | 0.8948 |
| Inflorescence – Branch | 0.600 | 0.698 | 173 | 0.860 | 0.8254 |
| Branch – Plant | 0.204 | 0.612 | 116 | 0.334 | 0.9871 |

## Analyses without ‘Apple’ studies:

**Table S8** Results of ANOVAs, excluding ‘Apple’ entries, for the effect of treatment (natural pollination, PD NAT, or hand pollen supplementation, PD SUP), supplement type and scale on pollinator dependence values obtained after hand supplementation. Model coefficients were obtained through GLMMs using gaussian distribution and logit function transformation with an adjusted factor of 0.01.

| Fixed Factor | response variable | Chisq | df | Pr(>Chisq) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Treatment | PD NAT; PD SUP | 9.5903 | 1 | 0.0020 |
| Supplement type | PD SUP | 4.2842 | 3 | 0.2324 |
| Scale | PD SUP | 8.3866 | 3 | 0.0387 |

**Table S9** Post-hoc tests, without ‘Apple’ entries, to test for differences between different methodologies used in hand pollen supplementation on pollination experiments, with estimate difference, SE value, df, t ratio and *P*-value for each comparison.

| Comparison | estimate | SE | df | t ratio | *P*-value |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| H – BEH | -0.5419 | 0.460 | 121 | -1.178 | 0.6419 |
| H – BH | -0.0173 | 0.376 | 139 | -0.046 | 1.0000 |
| H – EH | 0.8811 | 0.655 | 114 | 1.344 | 0.5368 |
| BEH – BH | 0.5246 | 0.500 | 142 | 1.049 | 0.7211 |
| BEH – EH | 1.4230 | 0.718 | 113 | 1.990 | 0.1980 |
| BH – EH | 0.8984 | 0.674 | 116 | 1.333 | 0.5439 |

**Table S10** Post-hoc tests for differences between experimental scales on pollination experiments, excluding ‘Apple’ entries, with estimate difference, SE value, df, t ratio and *P*-value for each comparison.

| Comparison | estimate | SE | df | t ratio | *P*-value |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Flower – Inflorescence | 1.0861 | 0.516 | 159 | 2.107 | 0.1554 |
| Flower – Branch | 0.1111 | 0.644 | 118 | 0.173 | 0.9982 |
| Flower – Plant | 1.0683 | 0.452 | 120 | 2.362 | 0.0902 |
| Inflorescence – Plant | -0.0178 | 0.579 | 128 | -0.031 | 1.0000 |
| Inflorescence – Branch | 0.9750 | 0.759 | 131 | 1.285 | 0.5742 |
| Branch – Plant | 0.9571 | 0.713 | 110 | 1.343 | 0.5380 |

## Analyses with all entries:

To identify methodological problems with pollinator exclusion and hand supplementation methodologies, outliers were visually inspected. Here we present the analyses with all entries of the dataset, including four entries where pollinator exclusion production was 25% higher than pollinator-associated production and 11 entries where pollen supplementation production was 25% lower than open pollination production

**Table S11** Results of ANOVAs, without removing entries, for the effect of treatment (natural pollination, PD NAT, or hand pollen supplementation, PD SUP), supplement type and scale on pollinator dependence values obtained after hand supplementation. Model coefficients were obtained through GLMMs using gaussian distribution and logit function transformation with an adjusted factor of 0.01.

| Fixed Factor | response variable | Chisq | df | Pr(>Chisq) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Treatment | PD NAT; PD SUP | 17.361 | 1 | < 0.0001 |
| Supplement type | PD SUP | 4.3308 | 3 | 0.2279 |
| Scale | PD SUP | 9.4602 | 3 | 0.0238 |

**Table S12** Post-hoc tests, without removing entries, to test for differences between different methodologies used in hand pollen supplementation on pollination experiments, with estimate difference, SE value, df, t ratio and *P*-value for each comparison.

| Comparison | estimate | SE | df | t ratio | *P*-value |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| H – BEH | -0.3070 | 0.4640 | 157 | -0.6610 | 0.9114 |
| H – BH | 0.3270 | 0.3520 | 137 | 0.9280 | 0.7898 |
| H – EH | 1.0150 | 0.6600 | 130 | 1.5370 | 0.4184 |
| BEH – BH | 0.6340 | 0.4960 | 176 | 1.2770 | 0.5785 |
| BEH – EH | 1.3220 | 0.7230 | 136 | 1.8290 | 0.2644 |
| BH – EH | 0.6880 | 0.6740 | 126 | 1.0210 | 0.7375 |

**Table S13** Post-hoc tests for differences between experimental scales on pollination experiments, without removing entries, with estimate difference, SE value, df, t ratio and *P*-value for each comparison.

| Comparison | estimate | SE | df | t ratio | *P*-value |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Flower – Inflorescence | 1.3060 | 0.5080 | 213.6 | 2.5700 | 0.0525 |
| Flower – Branch | 0.7830 | 0.5760 | 119.0 | 1.3610 | 0.5265 |
| Flower – Plant | 0.9120 | 0.4180 | 135.8 | 2.1810 | 0.1339 |
| Inflorescence – Plant | -0.3930 | 0.5560 | 176.3 | -0.7070 | 0.8942 |
| Inflorescence – Branch | 0.5220 | 0.6880 | 162.7 | 0.7590 | 0.8726 |
| Branch – Plant | 0.1290 | 0.5940 | 97.2 | 0.2170 | 0.9964 |

## Supporting Lists

### List of taxa included in the search

We based our search on a list of animal-pollinated crops (based on the list of produced crops of FAO 2021 [Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. Crops and livestock products. https://www.fao.org/faostat/en/#data/QCL (2021)]). Additionally, we crossed the list with previous compilations to find additional crops not included in the mentioned reference.

Synonyms and common names are indicated in () and [], respectively:

*Abelmoschus esculentus* [Okra]; *Acca sellowiana* (syn. *Feijoa sellowiana*) [Feijoa]; *Actinidia* (*A. deliciosa, A. chinensis, A. arguta*) [Kiwifruit, Golden Kiwifruit, Hardy Kiwi]; *Aegle marmelos* [Bael]; *Amomum subulatum* [Black cardamom]; *Anacardium occidentale* [Cashew]; *Annona* (*A. crassiflora, A. cherimoya, A. squamosa*) [Custard Apple, Araticum, Cherimoya, Sugar Apple]; *Arachis hypogaea* [Peanut]; *Arbutus unedo* [Strawberry tree]; *Artocarpus heterophyllus* [Jackfruit]; *Asimina* (*A. triloba, A. parviflora*) [Pawpaw]; *Averrhoa carambola* [Starfruit, Carambola]; *Berberis vulgaris* [Barberry]; *Bertholletia excelsa* [Brazil Nut]; *Bixa orelana* [Annato]; *Brassica* (*B. napus*, *B. nigra*, *B. juncea*, *B. campestris*, *B. rapa*) [Rapeseed, Oilseed Rape, Mustard Seed, Field Mustard, Canola]; *Cajanus cajan* [Pigeon Pea]; *Camellia oleifera* [Camellia]; *Canavalia* (*C. gladiata, C. ensiformes, C. rosea*) [Sword Bean, Jack Bean]; *Capparis spinosa* [Caper]; *Capsicum* (*C. annuum, C. chinense, C. frutescens*) [Chilli Pepper, Habanero Pepper, Tabasco Pepper]; *Carica papaya* [Papaya]; *Carthamus tinctorius* [Safflower]; *Carum carvi* [Caraway]; *Castanea* (*C. crenata*, *C. sativa*, *C. dentata*, *C. henryi*, *C. mollissima*, *C. pua*, *C. seguinii*) [Chestnut]; *Ceratonia siliqua* L. [Carob]; *Chaenomeles japonica* [Japanese Quince]; *Chrysophyllum cainito* [Star Apple]; *Cicer arietinum* L. [Chickpea]; *Cichorium* (*C. intybus, C. endiva*) [Chicory, Endive]; *Citrullus lanatus* [Watermelon]; *Citrus* (*C. maxima*, *C. reticulata*, *C. medica*, *C. clementine*, *C. limon*, *C. paradisi*, *C. sinensis*) [Pomelo, Mandarin, Citron, Clementine, Lemon, Grapefruit, Orange, Tangelo]; *Cocos nucifera* [Coconut]; *Coffea* (*C. arabica*, *C. canephora*) [Coffee]; *Cola* (*C. acuminata*, *C. nitida*) [Cola Nut]; *Cordeauxia edulis* [Yeheb Nut]; *Coriandrum sativum* [Coriander]; *Crataegus* (*C. azarolus*, *C. monogyna*) [Azarole, Hawthorn]; *Cucumis* (*C. melo*, *C. moschata*, *C. sativus*) [Cantaloupe, Melon, Crookneck Pumpkin, Cucumber]; *Cucurbita* (*C. maxima*, *C. pepo*, *C. moschata*, *C. acutangula*) [Pumpkin, Squash, Gourd, Zucchini]; *Cuminum cyminum* [Cumin]; *Cyamopsis tetragonoloba* [Guar Bean]; *Cydonia oblonga* [Quince]; *Cynara cardunculus* [Cardoon]; *Dimocarpus longan* [Longan]; *Diospyros* (*D. virginiana*, *D. kaki*) [Persimmon]; *Durio zibethinus* [Durian]; *Elaeis* (*E. guineensis*, *E. oleifera*) [Oil Palm]; *Elettaria cardamomum* [Cardamom]; *Eriobotrya japonica* [Loquat]; *Euterpe oleracea* [Açai]; *Fagopyrum esculentum* [Buckwheat]; *Ficus carica* [Fig]; *Foeniculum vulgare* [Fennel]; *Fragaria × ananassa* [Strawberry]; *Glycine max* [Soybean]; *Gossypium* (*G. hirsutum*, *G. barbadense*) [Cottonseed]; *Guizotia abyssinica* [Niger]; *Helianthus annuus* [Sunflower]; *Inga* (*I. edulis*, *I. stipularis*) [Ice Cream Bean]; *Jatropha curcas* [Jatrofa]; *Juglans regia* [Persian Walnut]; *Lablab purpureus* [Hyacinth Bean]; *Linum usitatissimum* [Linseed]; *Litchi chinensis* [Lychee]; *Lonicera caerulea* [Honeysuckle]; *Luffa* (*L. acutangula*, *L. aegyptica*) [Chinese Okra, Smoth Gourd]; *Macadamia* (*M. integrifolia*, *M. tetraphylla, M. ternifolia*) [Macadamia]; *Malpighia* (*M. emarginata*, *M. punicifolia*) [Indian Cherry, Acerola Cherry]; *Malus domestica* [Apple]; *Mammea americana* [Mammee]; *Mangifera indica* [Mango];

*Manilkara zapota* [Chicle]; *Medicago sativa* [Lucerne]; *Mespilus germanica* [Medlar]; *Momordica charantia* [Bitter Melon]; *Myrciaria dubia* [Camu Camu]; *Myristica fragrans* [Nutmeg]; *Nephelium lappaceum* [Rambutan]; *Nigella sativa* [Black Cumin]; *Opuntia ficus-indica* [Cactus Pear]; *Paeonia ostii* [Peony]; *Papaver somniferum* L. [Poppy seed]; *Parkia biglobosa* [African Locust Bean]; *Passiflora* (*P. edulis*, *P. ligularis*, *P. setacea*) [Passion Fruit, Granadilla, Passion Flower]; *Pastinaca sativa* [Parsnip]; *Persea americana* [Avocado]; *Petroselinum crispum* [Parsley]; *Phaseolus* (*P. vulgaris*, *P. coccineus*, *P. acutifolius*, *P. lunatus*) [Common Bean, Runner Bean, Tepary Bean, Lima Bean]; *Physalis* (*P. angulata*, *P. peruviana*) [Camapu, Goldenberry]; *Pimenta dioica* [Allspice]; *Pimpinella anisum* [Anise]; *Pistacia vera* [Pistachio]; *Polaskia chichipe* (syn. *Myrtillocactus chichipe*) [Chichituna]; *Poumora cecropiaefolia* [Mapati]; *Prunus* (*P. armeniaca*, *P. avium*, *P. cerasus*, *P. domestica*, *P. dulcis*, *P. salicina*, *P. persica*) [Apricot, Sweet Cherry, Sour Cherry, Plim, Almond, Japanese Plum, Peach, Nectarine]; *Psidium guajava* [Guava]; *Punica granatum* [Pomegranate]; *Pyrus* (*P. communis*, *P. pyrifolia*, *P. bretschneiderie*, *P. ussuriensis*) [Pear]; *Ribes* (*R. nigrum*, *R. rubrum*, *R. uva-crispa*) [Currant, Gooseberry]; *Ricinus communis* [Castor Bean, Ricinus]; *Rosa canina* [Rose Hip]; *Rubus* (*R. chamaemorus*, *R. fruticosus*, *R. idaeus*) [Raspberry, Blackberry, Loganberry]; *Sambucus* (*S. canadensis*, *S. nigra*) [Elderberry]; *Scorzonera hispanica* [Black Salsify]; *Sechium edule* [Chayote]; Selenicereus (syn. *Hylocereus)* spp. [Pitaya]; *Selenicereus megalanthus* [Yellow Pitaya]; *Sesamum indicum* [Sesame seed]; *Sinasis alba* [White Mustard]; *Solanum* (*S. betaceum*, *S. lycopersicon* (syn. *Lycopersicon lycopersicum*), *S. melongena*, *S. muricatum*, *S. ovigerum*, *S. quitoense*) [Tamarillo, Tomato, Aubergine, Eggplant, Pepino, Brinjal, Naranjillo, Lulo]; *Sorbus* (*S. aucuparia*, *S. domestica*) [Rowanberry, Service Apple]; *Spondias* (*S. mombin*, *S. tuberosa*) [Hog Plum, Brazil Plum]; *Tamarindus indica* [Tamarind]; *Theobroma* (*T. cacao*, *T. grandiflorum*) [Cocoa, Cupuaçu]; *Trichosanthes* (*T. cucumerina*, *T. dioica*) [Snake Gourd, Pointed Gourd]; *Trifolium alexandrinum* [Berseem]; *Vaccinium* (*V. angustifolium*, *V. corymbosum*, *V. macrocarpon*, *V. meridionale*, *V. myrtillus*, *V. oxycoccus*, *V. virgatum*, *V. vitis-idaea*) [Blueberry, Cranberry, Andean Berry]; *Vanilla* (*V. planifolia*, *V. pompona*) [Vanilla]; *Vernicia fordii* [Tungue]; *Vicia faba* [Fava Bean]; *Vigna* (*V. mungo, V. radiata*, *V. subterranea*, *V. unguiculata*) [Mung Bean, Bambara Groundnut, Black Gram, Black-eyed Pea]; *Vitellaria paradoxa* [Karite Nut]; *Ziziphus* (*Z. jujuba*, *Z. mauritiana*) [Jujube].

## List of search terms

The literature search was conducted on Scopus, Web of Science and Google Scholar. A general search was performed on the three databases and a literature search for included crop species (using list above) was performed on Web of Science and Google Scholar (see manuscript for strings used). The first 1000 records were considered. Study alerts were checked until March 1$^{st}$, 2022.

**- General search:**
Performed on Web of Science, Scopus and Google Scholar
Only the first 1000 results were used.

String 1: Crop AND (hand OR suppl) AND (natural OR open) AND pollination
A total of 1164 results were returned (94, 70 and 1000 for Web of Science, Scopus and Google Scholar, respectively)

String 2: Crop AND hand AND (pollen application OR supplementation) AND (natural OR open) AND (fruit OR seed) AND pollination NOT wild plant communit NOT natural pop
A total of 1017 results were returned (10, 7 and 1000 for Web of Science, Scopus and Google Scholar, respectively).

**- Specific search with crop terms:**
Performed on Web of Science and Google Scholar
Only the first 1000 results were used.

String 3: [Species / Crop name] AND (hand OR suppl) AND (natural OR open) AND pollination
A total of 28780 results were returned (535 and 28245 for Web of Science and Google Scholar, respectively).

A total of 30961 studies were identified. From the 30961 retrieved records, a total 294 records met the conditions to be included on PolLimCrop (Siopa et al. in revision), where detailed information can be found.

## List of taxa with pollinator dependence estimated values

Common names are provided in [ ]; crops in which pollinator dependence mean value includes values obtained from extra studies (see methods section) are indicated with *:

*Abelmoschus esculentus* Moench [Okra]*; *Acca sellowiana* (O.Berg) Burret [Feijoa]; *Actinidia chinensis* Planch. [Golden Kiwifruit]*; *Actinidia chinensis* var. *deliciosa* (A.Chev.) A.Chev. [Kiwifruit]; *Anacardium occidentale* L. [Cashew]; *Annona cherimola* Mill. [Cherimoya]*; *Annona crassiflora* Mart. [Marolo]; *Annona squamosa* L. [Sugar apple]; *Annona* spp. [Custard apple]; *Arachis hypogaea* L. [Peanut]*; *Artocarpus heterophyllus* Lam. [Jackfruit]; *Asimina parviflora* (Michx.) Dunal [Pawpaw]; *Averrhoa carambola* L. [Carambola]*; *Bertholletia excelsa* Bonpl. [Brazil nut]; *Bixa orellana* L. [Annatto]; *Brassica juncea* (L.) Czern. [Mustard seed]; *Brassica napus* L. [Oilseed rape]; *Brassica rapa* L. [Canola]*; *Cajanus cajan* (L.) Millsp. [Pigeon pea]; *Camellia oleifera* C.Abel [Camellia]; *Capparis spinosa* L. [Caper]; *Capsicum annuum* L. [Chili]; *Capsicum chinense* Jacq. []; *Carica papaya* L. [Papaya]; *Carthamus tinctorius* L. [Safflower]*; *Carum carvi* L. [Caraway seed]*; *Castanea crenata* Siebold & Zucc. [Japanese chestnut]*; *Castanea mollissima* Blume [Chinese chestnut]; *Castanea sativa* Mill. [European chestnut]*; *Castanea sativa* × *C. crenata* [Chestnut]*; *Cicer arietinum* L. [Chickpea]*; *Citrullus lanatus* (Thunb.) Matsum. & Nakai [Watermelon]; *Citrus clementina* hort. [Clementine]; *Citrus limon* (L.) Osbeck [Lemon]; *Citrus paradisi* Macfad. [Grapefruit]; *C. paradisi* × *C. reticulata* [Tangelo]; *Citrus reticulata* Blanco [Mandarin, Tangelo]*; *Citrus sinensis* (L.) Osbeck [Orange]*; *Cocos nucifera* L. [Coconut]*; *Coffea arabica* L. [Arabic coffee]; *Coffea canephora* Pierre ex A.Froehner [Coffee]; *Coriandrum sativum* L. [Coriander]*; *Cucumis melo* L. [Melon]; *Cucumis sativus* L. [Cucumber]*; *Cucurbita maxima* Duchesne [Pumpkin]*; *Cucurbita moschata* Duchesne [Gourd]; *Cucurbita pepo* L. [Squash and Courgette]; *Cuminum cyminum* L. [Cumin]*; *Cydonia oblonga* Mill. [Quince]*; *Dimocarpus longan* Lour. [Longan]*; *Diospyros kaki* L.f. [Persimmon]; *Durio zibethinus* L. [Durian]; *Elaeis guineensis* Jacq. [Oil palm]; *Elettaria cardamomum* (L.) Maton [Cardamom]*; *Eriobotrya japonica* (Thunb.) Lindl. [Loquat]; *Euterpe oleracea* Mart. [Açai]; *Fagopyrum esculentum* Moench [Buckwheat]*; *Ficus carica* L. [Fig]*; *Foeniculum vulgare* Mill. [Fennel]*; *Fragaria* × *ananassa* (Duchesne ex Weston) Duchesne ex Rozier [Strawberry]; *Glycine max* (L.) Merr. [Soybean]*; *Gossypium hirsutum* Cav. [Cottonseed]*; *Helianthus annuus* L. [Sunflower]; *Jatropha curcas* L. [Jatrofa]; *Linum usitatissimum* L. [Linseed]*; *Litchi chinensis* Sonn. [Lytchee]*; *Lonicera caerulea* L. [Honeysuckle]; *Luffa acutangula* Roxb. [Chinese okra]; *Luffa aegyptiaca* Mill. [Smooth gourd]; *Macadamia integrifolia* Maiden & Betche [Macadamia]; *Macadamia* spp. [Macadamia]; *Malpighia emarginata* DC. [Acerola cherry]; *Malus domestica* (Suckow) Borkh. [Apple]; *Mangifera indica* L. [Mango]; *Manilkara zapota* (L.) P.Royen [Sapodilla]*; *Momordica charantia* L. [Bitter melon]; *Myristica fragrans* Houtt. [Nutmeg]*; *Nephelium lappaceum* L. [Rambutan]*; *Nigella sativa* L. [Black cumin]; *Opuntia ficus-indica* (L.) Mill. [Cactus pear]*; *Paeonia ostii* T.Hong & J.X.Zhang [Peony]; *Papaver somniferum* L. [Poppy seed]*; *Passiflora edulis* Sims [Passion fruit]; *Passiflora ligularis* Juss. [Granadilla]; *Persea americana* Mill. [Avocado]; *Phaseolus coccineus* L. [Runner bean]*; *Phaseolus vulgaris* L. [Bean]*; *Physalis angulata* Ruiz & Pav. [Camapu]; *Physalis peruviana* Mill. [Goldenberry]; *Pimpinella anisum* L. [Anise]*; *Polaskia chichipe* (Rol.-Goss.) Backeb. [Chichituna]; *Prunus armeniaca* Thunb. [Apricot]; *Prunus avium* (L.) L. [Sweet cherry]; *Prunus cerasus* Scop. [Sour cherry]; *Prunus domestica* L. [Plum]*;*Prunus dulcis* (Mill.) Rchb. [Almond]; *Prunus persica* (L.) Batsch [Peach, Nectarine]*; *Psidium guajava* L.

[Guava]; *Psophocarpus tetragonolobus* (L.) DC. [Winged bean]*; *Punica granatum* L. [Pomegranate]; *Pyrus communis* Morog. [Pear]; *Ribes rubrum* L. [Currant]; *Ribes uva-crispa* L. [Gooseberry]*; *Ricinus communis* L. [Castor bean]; Rosa multiflora [Rose hip]*; *Rubus fruticosus* Marshall [Blackberry]*; *Rubus idaeus* Vell. [Raspberry]*; *Selenicereus* spp. [Red-peel pitahaya]; *Selenicereus undatus* (Haw.) D.R.Hunt [White-fleshed pitahaya]; *Sesamum indicum* L. [Sesame seed]*; *Solanum lycopersicum* L. [Tomato]; *Solanum melongena* L. [Eggplant]; *Solanum quitoense* Lam. [Naranjilla]*; *Spondias mombin* L. [Hog plum]; *Theobroma cacao* L. [Cocoa]; *Trichosanthes cucumerina* L. [Snake gourd]; *Trichosanthes dioica* Roxb. [Pointed gourd]; *Trifolium alexandrinum* L. [Berseem]; *Vaccinium corymbosum* L. [Highbush blueberry]; *Vaccinium macrocarpon* Aiton [Cranberry]; *Vaccinium myrtillus* L. [Bilberry]; *Vaccinium virgatum* Aiton [Rabbit-eye blueberry]; *Vaccinium vitis-idaea* L. [Linganberry]; *Vanilla planifolia* Andrews [Vanilla]*; *Vicia faba* L. [Broad bean]; *Vigna subterranea* (L.) Verdc. [Bambara bean]*; *Vigna unguiculata* (L.) Walp. [Cowpea]*; *Vitellaria paradoxa* C.F.Gaertn. [Karite nut]; *Ziziphus jujuba* Mill. [Jujube]*.

## Reference list from analyzed dataset


Abbate, A.P., Campbell, J.W., Vinson, E.L. & Williams, G.R. (2021). The pollination and fruit quality of two kiwifruit cultivars (Actinidia chinensis var. chinensis “AU Golden Sunshine” and ’AU Gulf Coast Gold’) (Ericales: Actinidiaceae) grown in the southeastern United States. *J Econ Entomol*, 114, 1234–1241.

Abdelgadir, H.A., Johnson, S.D. & van Staden, J. (2009). Pollinator effectiveness, breeding system, and tests for inbreeding depression in the biofuel seed crop, Jatropha curcas. *J Hortic Sci Biotechnol*, 84, 319–324.

Abu-Hammour, K.A. & Wittmann, D. (2011). Pollination of Nigella sativa L. (Ranunculaceae) in Jordan Valley to improve seed set. *Adv Hortic Sci*, 25, 212–222.

Almeida, G., Oliveira, D.E. & de Santana, F. (2012). Riqueza de espécies, abundância e eficiência de polinização de abelhas Centridini (Hymenoptera, Apidae) e nidificação de abelhas solitárias (Hymenoptera, Apoidea) em áreas cultivadas com aceroleira (Malpighia emarginata DC Malpighiaceae) no semiárido baiano.

Andrade, P.B. de, Freitas, B.M., de Macêdo Rocha, E.E., de Lima, J.A. & Rufino, L.L. (2014). biologia floral e exigências de polinização do gergelim (Sesamum indicum L.). *Acta Sci - Animal Sciences*, 36, 93–99.

Anooj, S.S., Malik, V.S., Sharma, S.K., Kumar, Y. & Rana, M.K. (2013). Impact of pollination methods on fruit yield of smooth gourd (Luffa aegyptica Mill.) in India. *Journal of Apiculture*, 279–284.

Arias-Suárez, J.C., Ocampo-Pérez, J.A. & Urrea-Gómez, R. (2014). La polinización natural en el maracuyá (Passiflora edulis f. flavicarpa Degener) como un servicio reproductivo y ecosistémico. *Agron Mesoam*, 73–83.

Atawia, A.R., Abd EL-Latif, F.M., EL-Badawy, H.E., Abo-Aziz, A.B. & Abdelkhalek, A. (2016). Effect of various pollen sources on flowering, fruiting and some fruit properties of clementine mandarin. *Egypt J Plant Breed*, 20, 91–106.

Bartual, A.M., Bocci, G., Marini, S. & Moonen, A.C. (2018). Local and landscape factors affect sunflower pollination in a Mediterranean agroecosystem. *PLoS One*, 13.

Bazo S., I., Espejo J., R., Palomino A., C., Flores P, M., Chang L., M., López B., C., *et al.* (2018). Estudios de biología floral, reproductiva y visitantes florales en el “Loche” de Lambayeque (Cucurbita moschata Duchesne). *Ecología Aplicada*, 17, 191.

Bell, M.C., Spooner-hart, R.N. & Haigh, A.M. (2009). Pollination of greenhouse tomatoes by the australian bluebanded bee Amegilla (Zonamegilla) holmesi (Hymenoptera: Apidae). *J Econ Entomol*, 99, 437–442.

Blochtein, B., Nunes-Silva, P., Halinski, R., Lopes, L.A. & Witter, S. (2014). Estudo comparativo da biologia floral e da resposta da produtividade à visita por insetos em duas cultivares de canola (Brassica napus L.) no Rio Grande do Sul. *Braz J Biol*, 74, 787–794.

Borketey-La, E.B. (2018). Role of pollinators and effectiveness of three pollination methods on the yield of pumpkin (Cucurbita pepo) at Ashanti. *Int J Sci Res*.

Bos, M.M., Veddeler, D., Bogdanski, A.K., Klein, A.M., Tscharntke, T., Steffan-Dewenter, I., *et al.* (2007). Caveats to quantifying ecosystem services: Fruit abortion blurs benefits from crop pollination. *Ecol Appl*, 17, 1841–1849.

Bosco, J. & Okullo, L. (2004). Vitellaria paradoxa in Uganda: Population structures and reproductive characteristics.

Brown, A.O. & Mcneil, J.N. (2006). Fruit production in cranberry (Ericaceae: Vaccinium macrocarpon): A bet-hedging strategy to optimize reproductive effort. *Am J Bot*, 93, 910–916.

Bumrungsri, S., Sripaoraya, E., Chongsiri, T., Sridith, K. & Racey, P.A. (2009). The pollination ecology of durian (Durio zibethinus, Bombacaceae) in southern Thailand. *J Trop Ecol*, 25, 85–92.

Button, L. & Elle, E. (2014). Wild bumble bees reduce pollination deficits in a crop mostly visited by managed honey bees. *Agric Ecosyst Environ*, 197, 255–263.

Campbell, A.J., Carvalheiro, L.G., Maués, M.M., Jaffé, R., Giannini, T.C., Freitas, M.A.B., *et al.* (2018a). Anthropogenic disturbance of tropical forests threatens pollination services to açaí palm in the Amazon river delta. *J Appl Ecol*, 55, 1725–1736.

Campbell, A.J., Wilby, A., Sutton, P. & Wäckers, F.L. (2017). Do sown flower strips boost wild pollinator abundance and pollination services in a spring-flowering crop? A case study from UK cider apple orchards. *Agric Ecosyst Environ*, 239, 20–29.

Campbell, J.W., Kimmel, C.B., Bammer, M., Stanley-Stahr, C., Daniels, J.C. & Ellis, J.D. (2018b). Managed and wild bee flower visitors and their potential contribution to pollination services of low-chill highbush blueberry (Vaccinium corymbosum L.; Ericales: Ericaceae). *J Econ Entomol*, 111, 2011–2016.

Cao, G.X., Lin, H.Q., Cheng, Y.H. & Wang, X. (2021). Factors affecting fruit and seed production of Paeonia ostii “Feng Dan”, an economically important oil tree. *Plant Species Biol*, 36, 258–268.

Castro, H., Siopa, C., Casais, V., Castro, M., Loureiro, J., Gaspar, H., *et al.* (2021). Spatiotemporal variation in pollination deficits in an insect-pollinated dioecious crop. *Plants*, 10.

Cavalcante, M.C., Oliveira, F.F., Maués, M.M. & Freitas, B.M. (2012). Pollination requirements and the foraging behavior of potential pollinators of cultivated Brazil nut (Bertholletia excelsa Bonpl.) trees in Central Amazon rainforest. *Psyche (London)*.

Cavalcante, T.R.M., Naves, R.V., Franceschinelli, E.V. & da Silva, R.P. (2009). Pollination and fruit development in araticum. *Bragantia, Campinas*, 68, 13–21.

Chacoff, N.P. & Aizen, M.A. (2007). Pollination requirements of pigmented grapefruit (Citrus paradisi Macf.) from northwestern Argentina. *Crop Sci*, 47, 1143–1150.

Chao, C.C.T. (2005). Pollination study of mandarins and the effect on seediness and fruit size: Implications for seedless mandarin production. *HortScience*, 40.

Chautá-Mellizo, A., Campbell, S.A., Bonilla, M.A., Thaler, J.S. & Poveda, K. (2012). Effects of natural and artificial pollination on fruit and offspring quality. *Basic Appl Ecol*, 13, 524–532.

Connelly, H., Poveda, K. & Loeb, G. (2015). Landscape simplification decreases wild bee pollination services to strawberry. *Agric Ecosyst Environ*, 211, 51–56.

Costa, G., Testolin, R. & Vizzotto, G. (1993). Kiwifruit pollination: An unbiased estimate of wind and bee contribution. *N Z J Crop Hortic Sci*, 21, 189–195.

Cruz, D.O. & Campos, L.A. (2007). Biologia floral e polinização de pimenta malagueta (Capsicum frutescens L., Solanaceae): um estudo de caso. *Acta Sci*, 29, 375–379.

Cuijpers, W. & Timmermans, B. (2016). *De rol van gedomesticeerde en wilde bestuivers in de teelt van blauwe bes*.

Cusser, S., Neff, J.L. & Jha, S. (2016). Natural land cover drives pollinator abundance and richness, leading to reductions in pollen limitation in cotton agroecosystems. *Agric Ecosyst Environ*, 226, 33–42.

Das, R., Mandal, S.K. & Maity, T.K. (2009). Insect pollinators of Pointed Gourd and effect of different artificial methods of pollination on fruit setting and subsequent development of fruits. *Veg. sci.*, 36, 353–355.

Davarynejad, G.H., Szabó, T., Szabó, Z., Soltész, M. & Davarynejad, &. (2010). Comparison of varying pollen source on productivity of sour cherry (Prunus cerasus L.) cultivars. *Int J Hortic Sci*, 16, 23–26.

Davidar, P. & Carr, S.A. (2015). Pollinator dependency, pollen limitation and pollinator visitation rates to six vegetable crops in southern India. *J Pollinat Ecol*, 16, 51–57.

Devi, M., Sharma, H.K., Thakur, R.K., Bhardwaj, S.K., Rana, K., Thakur, M., *et al.* (2017). Diversity of insect pollinators in reference to seed set of mustard (Brassica juncea L.). *Int J Curr Microbiol Appl Sci*, 6, 2131–2144.

Devika Rani, D., Yadav, S., Kaushik, H. & Narendra Kumar, G. (2016). Effect of different modes of pollination on yield parameters of summer squash (Cucurbita pepo L.) in India. *J Appl Nat Sci*, 8, 550–554.

Dorjay, N., Abrol, D.P. & Shankar, U. (2017). Insect visitors on cucumber and bittergourd flowers and impact on quantity of crop production by different pollination treatment. *J Apic*, 32, 77–88.

Elisante, F., Ndakidemi, P., Arnold, S.E.J., Belmain, S.R., Gurr, G.M., Darbyshire, I., *et al.* (2020). Insect pollination is important in a smallholder bean farming system. *PeerJ*, 8.

El-Sawa, S. (1998). Pollination and breeding of jackfruit (Artocarpus heterophyllus lam.) in South Florida.

Faoro, I.D. & Orth, A.I. (2011). Parthenocarpy in japanese pear tree cultivars in South Brazil. In: *XI Intern Pear Symp*.

Figueiredo, M.C.C., Passos, A.R., Hughes, F.M., Santos, K.S. dos, Silva, A.L. da & Soares, T.L. (2020). Reproductive biology of Physalis angulata L. (Solanaceae). *Sci Hortic*, 267.

Freihat, N.M., Al-Ghzawi, A.A.M., Zaitoun, S. & Alqudah, A. (2008). Fruit set and quality of loquats (Eriobotrya japonica) as effected by pollinations under sub-humid Mediterranean. *Sci Hortic*, 117, 58–62.

Freitas, B.M., Alves, J.E., Brandão, G.F. & Araujo, Z.B. (1999). Pollination requirements of West Indian cherry (Malpighia emarginata) and its putative pollinators, Centris bees, in NE Brazil. *J Agric Sci*, 133, 303–311.

Freitas, B.M. & Paxton, R.J. (1996). The role of wind and insects in cashew (Anacardium occidentale) pollination in NE Brazil. *The Journal of Agricultural Science, Cambridge*, 126, 319–326.

Fröborg, H. (1996). Pollination and seed production in five boreal species of Vaccinium and Andromeda (Ericaceae). *Canad J Bot*, 74, 1363–1368.

Garantonakis, N., Varikou, K., Birouraki, A., Edwards, M., Kalliakaki, V. & Andrinopoulos, F. (2016). Comparing the pollination services of honey bees and wild bees in a watermelon field. *Sci Hortic*, 204, 138–144.

Garratt, M.P.D., Breeze, T.D., Boreux, V., Fountain, M.T., McKerchar, M., Webber, S.M., *et al.* (2016). Apple pollination: Demand depends on variety and supply depends on pollinator identity. *PLoS One*, 11.

Garratt, M.P.D., Breeze, T.D., Jenner, N., Polce, C., Biesmeijer, J.C. & Potts, S.G. (2014). Avoiding a bad apple: Insect pollination enhances fruit quality and economic value. *Agric Ecosyst Environ*, 184, 34–40.

Garratt, M.P.D., de Groot, G.A., Albrecht, M., Bosch, J., Breeze, T.D., Fountain, M.T., *et al.* (2021a). Opportunities to reduce pollination deficits and address production shortfalls in an important insect-pollinated crop. *Ecol Appl*, 31.

Garratt, M.P.D., de Groot, G.A., Albrecht, M., Bosch, J., Breeze, T.D., Fountain, M.T., *et al.* (2021b). Opportunities to reduce pollination deficits and address production shortfalls in an important insect-pollinated crop. *Ecol Appl*, 31.

Gavilánez-Slone, J.M. (2000). Pollination and pollinators of pumpkin and squash (*Cucurbita maxima* Duchesne) grown for seed production in the Willamette Valley of Western Oregon.

George, A.P. & Nissen, R.J. (1988). The effects of temperature, vapour pressure deficit and soil moisture stress on growth, flowering and fruit set of custard apple (Annona cherimola X Annona squamosa) "African Pride." *Sci Hortic*, 34, 183–191.

George, A.P., Nissen, R.J., Morley Bunker, M.J. & Collins, R.J. (1993). Effects of pollination and irradiance on fruiting of persimmon (Diospyros kaki L.) in subtropical Australia. *J Hortic Sci*, 68, 447–454.

Gibbs, J., Elle, E., Bobiwash, K., Haapalainen, T. & Isaacs, R. (2016). Contrasting pollinators and pollination in native and non-native regions of highbush blueberry production. *PLoS One*, 11.

Gleiciani Bürger Patricio, by, Barufatti Grisolia, B., Cesar Desuó, I., Carolina Montagnana, P., Gonçalves Brocanelli, F., Goldoni Gomig, E., *et al.* (2012). The importance of bees for eggplant cultivations (Hymenoptera: Apidae, Andrenidae, Halictidae). In: *Sociobiology*.

Grass, I., Meyer, S., Taylor, P.J., Foord, S.H., Hajek, P. & Tscharntke, T. (2018). Pollination limitation despite managed honeybees in South African macadamia orchards. *Agric Ecosyst Environ*, 260, 11–18.

Groot, G.A. de, van Kats, R., Reemer, M., van der Sterren, D., Biesmeijer, J.C. & Kleijn, D. (2015). *De bijdrage van (wilde) bestuivers aan de opbrengst van appels en blauwe bessen*.

Guerrero-Prieto, V.M. (1984). Evaluation of pollinizers for "Royal Ann" sweet cherry (Prunus avium L.) in the Willamette Valley.

Gutiérrez-Chacón, C., Fornoff, F., Ospina-Torres, R. & Klein, A.M. (2018). Pollination of granadilla (Passiflora ligularis) benefits from large wild insects. *J Econ Entomol*, 111, 1526–1534.

Hansen, K., Sritongchuay, T., Bumrungsri, S., Simmons, B.I., Strange, N. & Dalsgaard, B. (2020). Landscape-level effects of forest on pollinators and fruit set of Guava (Psidium guajava L.) in orchards across Southern Thailand. *Diversity (Basel)*, 12.

Hickel, E.R. & Ducroquet, J.P.J. (2000). Polinização entomófila da goiabeira serrana, Feijoa sellowiana (Berg), em Santa Catarina. *Rev Bras Frutic*, 22, 96–101.

Holanda-Neto, J.P. de, Freitas, B.M., Bueno, D.M. & de Araújo, Z.B. (2002). Low seed/nut productivity in cashew (Anacardium occidentale): Effects of self-incompatibility and honeybee (Apis mellifera) foraging behaviour. *J Hortic Sci Biotechnol*, 77, 226–231.

Holzschuh, A., Dudenhöffer, J.H. & Tscharntke, T. (2012). Landscapes with wild bee habitats enhance pollination, fruit set and yield of sweet cherry. *Biol Conserv*, 153, 101–107.

Hossain, M., Yeasmin, F., Rahman, M., Akhtar, S. & Hasnat, M. (2018). Role of insect visits on cucumber (Cucumis sativus L.) yield. *J Biodivers Conserv Bioresour Manag*, 4, 81–88.

Howell, E., Russell, D., Mobashwer, A. & Topp, B. (2016). *Variability of initial and final nut setting in Macadamia superior selections through different pollination method*.

Howlett, B.G., Read, S.F.J., Alavi, M., Cutting, B.T., Nelson, W.R., Goodwin, R.M., *et al.* (2019). Cross-pollination enhances macadamia yields, even with branch-level resource limitation. *HortScience*, 54, 609–615.

Hudewenz, A., Pufal, G., Bögeholz, A.L. & Klein, A.M. (2014). Cross-pollination benefits differ among oilseed rape varieties. *Journal of Agricultural Science*, 152, 770–778.

Jat, M.K., Chaudhary, O.P., Kaushik, H.D., Yadav, S. & Tetarwal, A.S. (2014). Effect of different modes of pollination on quantitative and qualitative parameters of Egyptian Clover, Trifolium alexandrinum L. *J Appl Nat Sci*, 6, 605–611.

Jayanand, J.A. (2010). Pollinator diversity, foraging ecology and role of honeybees in seed production of sunflower (Helianthus annuus L.).

Karabiyik, S. (2011). Selection of suitable pollinizers for non-astringent (Diospyros kaki L.) cultivars.

Karimi, H.R. & Mirdehghan, S.H. (2015). Effects of self, open, and supplementary pollination on growth pattern and characteristics of pomegranate fruit. *Int J Fruit Sci*, 15, 382–391.

Karnatak. (2010). Impact of different methods of pollination on yield attributes of mustard (Brassica spp.).

Karunaratne, I., Perera, R.A.S.N. & Karunaratne, W.A.I.P. (2019). Floral visits of the wild bee, Lithurgus atratus, impact yield and seed germinability of okra, Abelmoschus esculentus, in Sri Lanka. *J Pollinat Ecol*, 25, 1–6.

Pritchard, K. (2005). The unseen costs of agricultural expansion across a rainforest landscape: depauperate pollinator communities and reduced yield in isolated crops.

Kendall, L.K., Gagic, V., Evans, L.J., Cutting, B.T., Scalzo, J., Hanusch, Y., *et al.* (2020). Self-compatible blueberry cultivars require fewer floral visits to maximize fruit production than a partially self-incompatible cultivar. *J Appl Ecol*, 57, 2454–2462.

Klein, A.M., Hendrix, S.D., Clough, Y., Scofield, A. & Kremen, C. (2015). Interacting effects of pollination, water and nutrients on fruit tree performance. *Plant Biol*, 17, 201–208.

Klein, A.-M., Steffan-Dewenter, I. & Tscharntke, T. (2003). Bee pollination and fruit set of Coffea arabica and C. canephora (Rubiaceae). *Am J Bot*, 90, 153–157.

Knapp, J.L. (2018). Cucurbit pollination: Mechanisms and management to optimise field quality and quantity.

Knapp, J.L. & Osborne, J.L. (2017). Courgette production: Pollination demand, supply, and value. *J Econ Entomol*, 110, 1973–1979.

Kodad, O. & Socias i Company, R. (2008). Fruit set evaluation for self-compatibility selection in almond. *Sci Hortic*, 118, 260–265.

Kouonon, L.C., Jacquemart, A.L., Zoro Bi, A.I., Bertin, P., Baudoin, J.P. & Dje, Y. (2009). Reproductive biology of the andromonoecious Cucumis melo subsp. agrestis (Cucurbitaceae). *Ann Bot*, 104, 1129–1139.

Krishnan, S., Kushalappa, C.G., Shaanker, R.U. & Ghazoul, J. (2012). Status of pollinators and their efficiency in coffee fruit set in a fragmented landscape mosaic in South India. *Basic Appl Ecol*, 13, 277–285.

Lakshmi, K.S. & Kuberappa, G.C. (2016). Impact of pollination modes during kharif and rabi seasons with special reference to honeybees on the quantitative and qualitative improvement of ridge gourd (Luffa acutangula L.). *Progressive Res Int J*, 11, 292–294.

Landaverde-González, P., Quezada-Euán, J.J.G., Theodorou, P., Murray, T.E., Husemann, M., Ayala, R., *et al.* (2017). Sweat bees on hot chillies: provision of pollination services by native bees in traditional slash-and-burn agriculture in the Yucatán Peninsula of tropical Mexico. *J Appl Ecol*, 54, 1814–1824.

Langridge, D.F. & Goodman, R.D. (1981). Honeybee pollination of sunflower cultivars Hysun 30 and Sunfola. *Aust J Exp Agric*, 21, 435–438.

Latet, G., Meesters, P. & Keulemans, J. (1999). Aspects of the influence of pollination methods and pollination time on the fruit set of red currants (Ribes rubrum L.). In: *VII Int Symp on Rubus and Ribes*.

Layek, U., Bera, K., Bera, B., Bisui, S., Pattanayek, S.K. & Karmakar, P. (2021). Assessment of yield enhancement in cashew (Anacardium occidentale L.) by the pollinator sharing effect of magnetic bee-friendly plants in India. *Acta Ecol Sin*, 41, 243–252.

Layek, U., Kundu, A. & Karmakar, P. (2020). Floral ecology, floral visitors and breeding system of Gandharaj lemon (Citrus × limon L. Osbeck). *Bot Pac*, 9, 1–7.

Li, K., Grass, I., Fung, T.Y., Fardiansah, R., Rohlfs, M., Buchori, D., *et al.* (2022). Adjacent forest moderates insect pollination of oil palm. *Agric Ecosyst Environ*, 338.

Lobaton, J., Andrew, R., Duitama, J., Kirkland, L., Macfadyen, S. & Rader, R. (2021). Using RNA-seq to characterize pollen–stigma interactions for pollination studies. *Sci Rep*, 11.

Lundin, O. & Raderschall, C.A. (2021). Landscape complexity benefits bumble bee visitation in faba bean (Vicia faba minor L.) but crop productivity is not pollinator-dependent. *Agric Ecosyst Environ*, 314.

Maciel, M.S. (2019). Polinização da abóbora (Cucurbita moschata D.): biologia floral, visitantes florais e requerimentos de polinização.

MacInnis, G. & Forrest, J.R.K. (2019). Pollination by wild bees yields larger strawberries than pollination by honey bees. *J Appl Ecol*, 56, 824–832.

MacKenzie, K.E. (1997). Pollination requirements of three highbush blueberry (Vaccinium corymbosum L.) cultivars. *J Am Soc Hortic*, 122.

Mallinger, R. & Prasifka, J. (2017). Benefits of insect pollination to confection sunflowers differ across plant genotypes. *Crop Sci*, 57, 3264–3272.

Mary Lucy Oronje. (2012). Pollinator diversity, behaviour and limitation on yield of karela (Momordica charantia L. Cucurbitaceae) in Western Kenya. *Afr J Agric Res*, 7.

Mascena, V.M. (2011). *Abelhas visitantes florais, potenciais polinizadoras do algodoeiro (Gossypium hirsutum L.) em cultivo agroecológico*.

Mateos, Z., Fountain, M.T., Mateos-Fierro, Z., Shaw, B., Brain, P. & Delgado, A. (2019). Insect pollinators of conference pear (Pyrus communis L.) and their contribution to fruit quality. *J Pollinat Ecol*, 25, 103–114.

McLaren, G.F. & Fraser, J.A. (1996). Pollination compatibility of “Sundrop” apricot and its progeny in the “Clutha” series. *N Z J Crop Hortic Sci*, 24, 47–53.

Mélo, D.B. (2010). Polinização da abóbora (Curcubita moschata D.) pela abelha Arapuá (Trigona spinipes): requerimentos da cultura e eficiência do polinizador.

Mesquita, F.L.A. (2008). Abelhas visitantes das flores do urucuzeiro (Bixa orellana L.) e suas eficiências de polinização.

Miñarro, M. & Twizell, K.W. (2015). Pollination services provided by wild insects to kiwifruit (Actinidia deliciosa). *Apidologie*, 46, 276–285.

Mkindi, G.M. (2017). Effect of insect pollinators and natural enemies on common bean (Phaseolus vulgaris L.) growth and yield in Arusha, Tanzania.

Moffett, J.O., Rodney, D.R. & Shipman, C.W. (1979). Effect of hand pollination with nine Citrus cultivars on yields of Minneola Tangelo. *J Ariz-Nev Acad Sci*, 14, 47–49.

Moo-Aldana, R.D., Munguía-Rosas, M.A., Serralta, L.P., Castillo-Burguete, M.T., Vega-Frutis, R. & Martínez-Natarén, D. (2017). Can the introduction of modern crop varieties in their centre of origin affect local ecological knowledge? A case study of papaya in the Yucatan Peninsula. *Hum Ecol*, 45, 367–375.

Morales, C.L. (2009). Pollination requirement of raspberry in SW Argentina: Preliminary results. *Int J Plant Reprod Biol*, 1, 195–198.

Munyuli, T. (2014). Influence of functional traits on foraging behaviour and pollination efficiency of wild social and solitary bees visiting coffee (Coffea canephora) flowers in Uganda. *Grana*, 53, 69–89.

Mussury, R.M. & Fernandes, W.D. (2000). Studies of the floral biology and reproductive system of Brassica napus L. (Cruciferae). *Braz Arch Biol Technol*, 43, 111–117.

Nagarajan, B., Nicodemus, A., Mandal, A.K., Verma, R.K., Gireesan, K. & Mahadevan, N.P. (1998). Phenology and controlled pollination studies in Tamarind. *Silvae Genet*, 47, 5–6.

Negussie, A., Achten, W.M.J., Verboven, H.A.F., Hermy, M. & Muys, B. (2014). Floral display and effects of natural and artificial pollination on fruiting and seed yield of the tropical biofuel crop Jatropha curcas L. *GCB Bioenergy*, 6, 210–218.

Neto, F.H. (2010). Abelhas visitantes florais e potenciais polinizadoras do café (Coffea arabica L.) ecológico e sombreado no Maciço de Baturité-Ceará.

Nikkeshi, A., Inoue, H., Arai, T., Kishi, S. & Kamo, T. (2019). The bumblebee Bombus ardens ardens (Hymenoptera: Apidae) is the most important pollinator of Oriental persimmon, Diospyros kaki (Ericales: Ebenaceae), in Hiroshima, Japan. *Appl Entomol Zool*, 54, 409–419.

Nishida, T. (1958). Pollination of the passion fruit in Hawaii. *J Econ Entomol*, 51, 146–149.

Norfolk, O., Eichhorn, M.P. & Gilbert, F. (2016). Flowering ground vegetation benefits wild pollinators and fruit set of almond within arid smallholder orchards. *Insect Conserv Divers*, 9, 236–243.

Norman, E.M., Rice, K. & Cochran, S. (1992). Reproductive biology of Asimina parviflora (Annonaceae). *Bull Torrey Bot Club*, 119, 1–5.

Nuanjunkong, N., Tongurai, C., Tzen, J.T.C., Jiang, P.-L. & Meesawat, U. (2018). *Features of Jatropha curcas seed oil in relation to different pollination methods*. *Songklanakarin Journal of Science and Technology SJST*.

Nuanjunkong, N., Tongurai, C., Tzen, J.T.C., Jiang, P.-L. & Meesawat, U. (2021). Features of Jatropha curcas seed oil in relation to different pollination methods. *Songklanakarin J Sci Technol*, 43, 275–282.

Nurul Huda, A., Che Salmah, M.R., Abu Hassan, A., Hamdan, A. & Abdul Razak, M.N. (2015). Pollination services of mango flower pollinators. *J Insect Sci*, 15.

Oliveira, M.O. (2010). Abelhas visitantes florais e potenciais polinizadores da cajazeira (Spondias mombin L.) sob cultivo, na Chapada do Apodi, Ceará.

Open, A., Garratt, M.P.D., Evans, D.J., Moss, R.L., Dodson, E.D., Jenner, C., *et al.* (2014). Pollination deficits in UK apple orchards. *J Pollinat Ecol*, 12, 9–14.

Osterman, J., Theodorou, P., Radzevičiūtė, R., Schnitker, P. & Paxton, R.J. (2021). Apple pollination is ensured by wild bees when honeybees are drawn away from orchards by a mass co-flowering crop, oilseed rape. *Agric Ecosyst Environ*, 315.

Otero-Arnaiz, A., Casas, A., Bartolo, C., Pé Rez-Negro´n, E., Negro´n, N. & Valiente-Banuet, A. (2003). Evolution of Polaskia chichipe (Cactaceae) under domestication in the Tehuacán Valley, central Mexico: reproductive biology. *Am J Bot*, 90, 593–602.

Ouvrard, P., Quinet, M. & Jacquemart, A.L. (2017). Breeding system and pollination biology of Belgian oilseed rape cultivars (Brassica napus). *Crop Sci*, 57, 1455–1463.

Pavanelo, A.M. (2019). Biologia reprodutiva e da polinização de Physalis peruviana L.

Pérez-Balam, J., Quezada-Euán, J.J.G., Alfaro-Bates, R., Medina, S., Mckendrick, L., Soro, A., *et al.* (2012). The contribution of honey bees, flies and wasps to avocado (Persea americana) pollination in southern Mexico. *J Pollinat Ecol*, 8, 42–47.

Pisanty, G., Afik, O., Wajnberg, E. & Mandelik, Y. (2016). Watermelon pollinators exhibit complementarity in both visitation rate and single-visit pollination efficiency. *J Appl Ecol*, 53, 360–370.

Potter, A. & LeBuhn, G. (2015). Pollination service to urban agriculture in San Francisco, CA. *Urban Ecosyst*, 18, 885–893.

Pudasaini, R. & Thapa, R.B. (2014). Effect of pollination on rapeseed (Brassica campestris L. var. toria) production in Chitwan, Nepal. *The J Agric Env*, 15.

Revanasidda & Belavadi, V. v. (2019). Floral biology and pollination in Cucumis melo L., a tropical andromonoecious cucurbit. *J Asia Pac Entomol*, 22, 215–225.

Rizzardo, R.A. (2012). A abelha melífera africanizada (Apis mellifera L.) na polinização e produção de óleo das sementes do pinhão-manso (Jatropha curcas L.).

Rizzardo, R.A.G., Milfont, M.O., da Silva, E.M.S. & Freitas, B.M. (2012). Apis mellifera pollination improves agronomic productivity of anemophilous castor bean (Ricinus communis). *An Acad Bras Cienc*, 84.

Samnegård, U., Alins, G., Boreux, V., Bosch, J., García, D., Happe, A.K., *et al.* (2019). Management trade-offs on ecosystem services in apple orchards across Europe: Direct and indirect effects of organic production. *J Appl Ecol*, 56, 802–811.

Samnegård, U., Hambäck, P.A., Lemessa, D., Nemomissa, S. & Hylander, K. (2016). A heterogeneous landscape does not guarantee high crop pollination. *Proc Royal Soc B: Biol Sci*, 283.

Samocha, Y., Eisikowitch, D. & Vaknin, Y. (2014). Pollen source effects on fruit and seed traits of Jatropha curcas L. - A renewable biodiesel feedstock. *Bioenergy Res*, 7, 1270–1279.

Santos, R.S. (2016). Requerimentos reprodutivos de duas culturas agrícolas no agreste pernambucano.

Santos, R.S. da, Carneiro, L.T., Peroba de Oliveira Santos, J., Silva, M.M. da, de Oliveira Milfont, M. & Castro, C.C. (2021). Bee pollination services and the enhancement of fruit yield associated with seed number in self-incompatible tangelos. *Sci Hortic*, 276.

Sezerino, A.A. & Orth, A.I. (2015). Pollination of the portuguese pear in Bom Retiro-SC, Brazil. *Rev Bras Frutic*, 37, 943–951.

Shi, Z. & Stösser, R. (2005). Reproductive biology of chinese chestnut (Castanea mollissima Blume). *Europ J Hort Sci*, 70, 1611–4426.

Siag Surjit. (2014). Studies on floral biology, pollination and fruit set in kiwifruit (Actinidia deliciosa (A. Chev.).

Silva, E.M., Freitas, B.M., Silva, L.A., Cruz, D.O. & Bomfim, G.A. (2005). Floral biology of sweet pepper (Capsicum annuum) and the use of the stinglessbee (Melipona subnitida Ducke) as its pollinator in enclosure. *Rev Cienc Agron*, 36, 386–390.

Silva, E.M.S. (2007). Abelhas visitantes florais do algodoeiro (Gossypium hirsutum) em Quixeramobim e Quixeré, estado do Ceará, e seus efeitos na qualidade da fibra e semente.

Silveira, M. v., Abot, A.R., Nascimento, J.N., Rodrigues, E.T., Rodrigues, S.R. & Puker, A. (2012). Is manual pollination of yellow passion fruit completely dispensable? *Sci Hortic*, 146, 99–103.

Singh, A.K. (2016a). Insect pollinators and productivity of pigeonpea. *Indian J Entomol*, 78, 163.

Singh, A.K. (2016b). Insect pollinators and productivity of Pigeonpea. *Indian Journal of Entomology*, 78, 163.

Sinhaseni, K. & Catterall, C.P. (2021). Tropical fruit production depends on wild insect communities: Bees and lychees in Thailand. *J Trop Ecol*, 37, 26–34.

Siqueira, M. de, Maria, K., Martins, F., Kiill, P., Helena, L. & Silva, T. (2011). Estudo comparativo da polinização em variedades de aceroleiras (Malpighia emarginata DC, Malpighiaceae). *Rev Caatinga*.

Soares, T.L., de Jesus, O.N., de Souza, E.H. & de Oliveira, E.J. (2015). Reproductive biology and pollen-pistil interactions in Passiflora species with ornamental potential. *Sci Hortic*, 197, 339–349.

Socias I Company, R., Alonso, J.M. & Gómez Aparisi, J. (2004). Fruit set and productivity in almond as related to self-compatibility, flower morphology and bud density. *J Hortic Sci Biotechnol*, 79, 754–758.

Socias I Company, R. & Felipe, A.J. (1992). Self-compatibility and autogamy in 'Guara' almond. *J Hortic Sci*, 67, 313–317.

Stanley, D.A., Gunning, D. & Stout, J.C. (2013). Pollinators and pollination of oilseed rape crops (Brassica napus L.) in Ireland: Ecological and economic incentives for pollinator conservation. *J Insect Conserv*, 17, 1181–1189.

Stout, J.C., Nombre, I., de Bruijn, B., Delaney, A., Adzo Doke, D., Gyimah, T., *et al.* (2018). Insect pollination improves yield of Shea (Vitellaria paradoxa subs. paradoxa) in the agroforestry parklands of West Africa. *J Pollinat Ecol*, 22, 11–20.

Tatari, M., Ghasemi, A., Mousavi, A. & Bahrami, H. (2017). Study on pollination and selection of the most suitable pollinizers for commercial pear cultivars (Pyrus communis L.) in Iran. *J Hortic Res*, 25, 49–57.

Thallyta, H., Mendes, A., Regina Costa, M., Nietsche, S., Alison, J., Oliveira, A., *et al.* (2012). Pollen grain germination and fruit set in "Brazilian seedless" sugar apple (Annona Pollen grain germination and fruit set in "Brazilian seedless" sugar apple (Annona squamosa L.). *Crop Breed Appl Biotechnol*, 12, 277–280.

Tran, D.H. & Yen, C.R. (2014). Morphological characteristics and pollination requirement in red pitaya (Hylocereus spp.). *Int J Sci Res Innov*, 8.

Uma Shankar, I.S. & Amit Mondal, D.P.A. (2017). Diversity of insect pollinators associated with pigeonpea, Cajanus cajan L. Mill sp. and their impact on crop production. *Int J Curr Microbiol Appl Sci*, 6, 528–535.

Velázquez-López, R., Wegier, A., Alavez, V., Pérez-López, J., Vázquez-Barrios, V., Arroyo-Lambaer, D., *et al.* (2018). The mating system of the wild-to-domesticated complex of Gossypium hirsutum L. Is mixed. *Front Plant Sci*, 9.

Vladek, A., Hýbl, M. & Pridal, A. (2018). Pollination and pollinators of haskap (Lonicera caerulea). In: *Int PhD Stud Conf MendelNet*.

Wallace, H.M., Vithanage, V. & Exley, E.M. (1996). The effect of supplementary pollination on nut set of macadamia (Proteaceae). *Ann Bot*, 78, 765–773.

Wayo, K., Phankaew, C., Stewart, A.B. & Bumrungsri, S. (2018). Bees are supplementary pollinators of self-compatible chiropterophilous durian. *J Trop Ecol*, 34, 41–52.

Webber, S.M., Garratt, M.P.D., Lukac, M., Bailey, A.P., Huxley, T. & Potts, S.G. (2020). Quantifying crop pollinator-dependence and pollination deficits: The effects of experimental scale on yield and quality assessments. *Agric Ecosyst Environ*, 304.

Wietzke, A., Westphal, C., Gras, P., Kraft, M., Pfohl, K., Karlovsky, P., *et al.* (2018). Insect pollination as a key factor for strawberry physiology and marketable fruit quality. *Agric Ecosyst Environ*, 258, 197–204.

Witte, K. de, Vercammen, J., van Daele, G. & Keulemans, J. (1996). Fruit set, seed set and fruit weight in apple as influenced by emasculation, self-pollination and cross-pollination. In: *II Workshop Poll*.

Woodburn, K.R. & Andersen, P.C. (1996). Pollination and pollen source influence fruit of oriental persimmon "Fuyu" and "Tanenashi." *HortScience*, 31, 218–221.

Wu, P., Tscharntke, T., Westphal, C., Wang, M., Olhnuud, A., Xu, H., *et al.* (2021). Bee abundance and soil nitrogen availability interactively modulate apple quality and quantity in intensive agricultural landscapes of China. *Agric Ecosyst Environ*, 305.

Xie, Z., Chen X & Qiu, J. (2013). Reproductive failure of Camellia oleifera in the plateau region of China due to a shortage of legitimate pollinators. *Int J Agric Biol*.

Yourstone, J., Gunnarsson, J., Smith, H.G. & Somanathan, H. (2001). High dependency of chillifruit set on wild pollinators in Southern India. In: *SCAPE*. pp. 65–74.

Zaitoun, S. & Al-Ghzawi, A.A.-M. (2016). Influence of elevation on honeybees Apis mellifera syriaca (Hymenoptera: Apidae) flight activities and its impact on fruit set and quality of watermelon (Citrullus lanatus, cucurbitaceae). In: *III Int Conf Agric For*. pp. 127–134.

Zhang, T. & Tan, D.Y. (2009). An examination of the function of male flowers in an andromonoecious shrub Capparis spinosa. *J Integr Plant Biol*, 51, 316–324.

## Reference list from extra articles

Abd El-Wahab, T.E., Ebadah, I.M.A., & Mahmoud, Y. A. (2012). Insect pollinators of anise plants (Pimpinella anisum L.) and the important role of honeybees (Apis mellifera L.) on their yield productivity. *Archives of Phytopathology and Plant Protection*, 45, 677-685.

Andrikopoulos, C.J. & Cane, J.H. (2018). Comparative pollination efficacies of five bee species on raspberry. *J Econ Entomol*, 111, 2513–2519.

Azo'o, E.M., Fohouo, F.T. & Messi, J. (2011). Influence of the foraging activity of the entomofauna on okra (Abelmoschus esculentus) in seed Yield. *Int J Agric Biol*, 13, 761–765.

Bala, J.I. (1993). Floral biology and the compatibility system in ciku cv. Jantung (Manilkara achras). *MARDI Res. J.*, 21, 27–34.

Barbir, J., Badenes-Pérez, F.R., Fernández-Quintanilla, C. & Dorado, J. (2015). Can floral field margins improve pollination and seed production in coriander Coriandrum sativum L. (Apiaceae)? *Agric For Entomol*, 17, 302–308.

Benedek, P., Szabó, T. & Nyéki, J. (2000). New results on the bee pollination of quince (Cydonia oblonga Mill.). In: *VIII International Symposium on Pollination-Pollination: Integrator of Crops and Native Plant Systems*, 561, 243-248.

Blanche, K.R., Hughes, M., Ludwig, J.A. & Cunningham, S.A. (2006). Do flower-tripping bees enhance yields in peanut varieties grown in north Queensland? *Aust. J. Exp. Agric. e*, 46, 1529-1534.

Blanche, K.R., Ludwig, J.A. & Cunningham, S.A. (2006). Proximity to rainforest enhances pollination and fruit set in orchards. *J. Appl. Ecol.*, 43, 1182–1187.

Blettler, D.C., Fagúndez, G.A. & Caviglia, O.P. (2018). Contribution of honeybees to soybean yield. *Apidologie*, 49, 101–111.

Chaudhary, O.P. & Kumar, R. (2000). Studies on honeybee foraging and pollination in cardamom (Elettaria cardamomum Maton). *JOSAC*, 9, 37–42.

Chiari, W.C., de Toledo, V.A.A., Ruvolo-Takasusuki, M.C.C., de Oliveira, A.J.B., Sakaguti, E.S., Attencia, V.M., *et al.* (2005). Pollination of soybean (Glycine max L. Merril) by honeybees (Apis mellifera L.). *Braz. Arch. Boil. Technol.*, 48, 31–36.

Dan, S., Murungi, L.K. & Kioko E. (2019). Diversity and abundance of insect pollinators and their effect on yield and quality of cowpea and cucumber in Makueni, Kenya. *Afr. J. Hort. Sci.*, 16, 41–52.

Doku, E.V. (1968). Flowering, pollination and pod formation in bambara groundnut (Voandzeia subterranea) in Ghana. Experimental Agriculture, 4, 41-48.

Free, J.B. (1966). The pollination of the beans phaseolus multiflorus and Phaseolus vulgaris by honeybees. *J Apic Res*, 5, 87–91.

Girardeau, J.H. & Leuck, D.B. (1967). Effect of mechanical and bee tripping on yield of the peanut. *J Econ Entomol*, 60, 1454-1455.

Goodman, R., Hepworth, G., Kaczynski, P., McKee, B., Clarke, S. & Bluett, C. (2001). Honeybee pollination of buckwheat (*Fagopyrum esculentum* Moench) cv. Manor. *Aust. J. Exp. Agric.*, 41, 1217-1221.

Higuchi, H., Tsukada, M., Ninomiya, T., Furukawa, T., Yoshida, A. & Kuriyama, M. (2014). Pollination of cherimoya (Annona cherimola Mill.) by the mass-propagated beetles Haptoncus ocularis, Mimemodes monstrosus, and Carpophilus marginellus. *Trop. Agr. Develop.*, 58, 18–25.

Hssaini, L., Razouk, R., Irchad, A., Aboutayeb, R. & Ouaabou, R. (2022). Do pollination and pollen sources affect fig seed set and quality? First attempt using chemical and vibrational fingerprints coupled with chemometrics. *J Chem*, 2022.

Kendall, D.A. & Smith, B.D. (1976). The pollinating efficiency of honeybee and bumblebee visits to flowers of the runner bean Phaseolus coccineus L. *J. Appl. Ecol.*, 13, 749–752.

Knight Jr, R.J. (1965). Heterostyly and pollination in carambola. In: *Proc. Flo. State Hort. Soc.*

Kuriakose, G., Sinu, P.A. & Shivanna, K.R. (2009). Domestication of cardamom (Elettaria cardamomum) in Western Ghats, India: divergence in productive traits and a shift in major pollinators. *Ann Bot*, 103, 727–733.

Lal, N., Gupta, A.K., Marboh, E.S., Kumar, A. & Nath, V. (2021). Effect of mode of pollination on fruit set and fruit characteristics in litchi. *Erwerbs-Obstbau*, 63, 227–232.

Langridge, D. F., & Goodman, R. D. (1975). A study on pollination of oilseed rape (Brassica campestris). *Australian Journal of Experimental Agriculture*, 15, 285-288.

Langridge, D.F. & Goodman, R.D. (1979). Pollination of canning peaches cv. Golden Queen. *Aust. J. Exp. Agr. Ani. Husb.*, 19, 510–512.

Larue, C., Austruy, E., Basset, G. & Petit, R.J. (2021). Revisiting pollination mode in chestnut (Castanea spp.): an integrated approach. *Bot Lett*, 168, 348–372.

Latif, A., Malik, S.A., Saeed, S., Iqbal, N., Saeed, Q., Khan, K.A., *et al.* (2019). Diversity of pollinators and their role in the pollination biology of chickpea, Cicer arietinum L.(Fabaceae). *J. Asia Pac. Entomol.*, 22, 597-601.

Lee, K.Y., Cho, H., Yoon, H.J., Lee, S. & Ko, H. (2019). Comparison of the foraging activity and pollination effects of honeybees (Apis mellifera L.) and bumblebees (Bombus terrestris L.) in Gold Kiwi (Actinidia chinensis P. 'Haegeum'). *Journal of Apiculture*, 34, 295–304.

McMurray, D.J. (1985). Inheritance of Pigmentation and Pod Shape in Winged Bean (*Psophocarpus tetragonolobus*). University of Hawai'i at Manoa.

Malerbo-Souza D T, Nogueira-couto R H & Couto L A. (2004). Honey bee attractants and pollination in sweet orange, Citrus sinensis (L.) Osbeck, var. Pera-rio. *J. Venom. Anim. Toxins incl. Trop. Dis.*, 10, 144–153.

Manino, A., Patetta, A. & Marletto, F. (1991). Investigations on chestnut pollination. In: *VI Pollination Symposium*.

Meena, N.K., Lal, G., Meena, R.S. & Meena, R.D. (2018). Pollinator's diversity and abundance on cumin (Cuminum cyminum L.) and their impact on yield enhancement at semi-arid regions. *J Entomol Zool Stud*, 6, 1017–1021.

Meléndez-Ramírez, V., Parra-Tabla, V., Kevan, P.G., Ramírez-Morillo, I., Harries, H., Fernández-Barrera, M., *et al.* (2004). Mixed mating strategies and pollination by insects and wind in coconut palm (*Cocos nucifera* L. (Arecaceae)): importance in production and selection. *Agric. For. Entomol*, 6, 155-163.

Messinger, J., Martini, M.M.F., Rossi, G., Samuels, J. & Lauerer, M. (2016). Successful pollination of the N eotropical crop S olanum quitoense by B ombus terrestris: behaviour, efficiency and yield. *J. Appl. Entomol.*, 140, 124-134.

Milatović, D., Đurović, D., Zec, G. & Boškov, Đ. (2017). Evaluation of growth and productivity of some European plum cultivars. In: *II International Symposium on Fruit Culture along Silk Road Countries*.

Milfont, M. de O., Rocha, E.E.M., Lima, A.O.N. & Freitas, B.M. (2013). Higher soybean production using honeybee and wild pollinators, a sustainable alternative to pesticides and autopollination. *Environ Chem Lett*, 11, 335–341.

Moffett, J.O., Rodney, D.R., Shipman, C.W. & Moffett2, J. 0. (1981). Influence of pollen source and time of bloom on fruit set of Fairchild tangerine. *JANAS*, 16, 43–45.

Monasterolo, M., Chacoff, N.P., Segura, Á.D., Benavidez, A. & Schliserman, P. (2022). Native pollinators increase fruit set while honeybees decrease the quality of mandarins in family farms. *Basic Appl Ecol*, 64, 79–88.

Mota, M.O.S. & Nogueira-Couto, R.H. (2002). Entomophilous pollination in peach (Prunus persica L.). *Braz J Vet Res Anim Sci*, 39, 124–128.

Nazeem, P.A. & Sivaraman Nair, P.C. (1981). Fruit set, fruit development and fruit drop in nutmeg (Myristica fragrans Houtt.). *Agri. Res. J. Kerala*, 19, 10-14.

Nissar, V.M., Hrideek, T.K., Kuruvilla, K.M., Madhusoodanan, K.J., & Thomas, J. (2006). Studies on pollination, inter specific hybridization and fruit development in vanilla. *Journal of Plantation Crops*, 34, 167.

Nyéki, J. & Szabó, Z. (1996). Fruit set of self and pollen pollinated peach flowers under hungarian ecological conditions. In: *III International Symposium Peach*.

Oliveira, D. de, Gomes, A., Ilharco, F.A., Manteigas, A.M., Pinto, J. & Ramalho, J. (2001). Importance of insect pollinators for the production in the chestnut, Castanea sativa. In: *VIII Poll. Symp.*

Pandey, R.S., & Yadava, R.P.S. (1970). Pollination of litchi (Litchi chinensis) by insects with special reference to honeybees. *Journal of Apicultural Research*, 9, 103-105.

Pandey, A. & Kumari, A. (2008). Pollination ecology of safflower (Carthamus tinctorius linn). In: *VII Intern. Safflower Conf.*

Partap, U., Shukla, A.N. & Verma, L.R. (2000). Pollination of peach and plum by Apis cerana. Asian bees and beekeeping: progress of research and development. Oxford and IBH, New Delhi, 171-173.

Pham, H.D. (2012). Pollination biology of jujubes and longans and the importance of insects in the pollination of crops in Vietnam.

Pinzauti, M., Lazzarini, D. & Felicioli, A. (1997). Preliminary investigation of Osmia cornuta Latr. (Hymenoptera, Megachilidae) as a potential pollinator for blackberry (Rubus fruticosus L.) under confined environment. In: *Intern. Symp. on Pollination*.

Quagliotti, L. & Marletto, F. (1987). Research on the pollination of Runner Bean (Phaseolus coccineus L.) for dry grain production. *Adv Hortic Sci*, 1, 43–49.

Rai, A. B., & Chaurasia, S. (2008). Effect of Apis mellifera pollination on the yield attributing characters and yield of cucumber (Cucumis sativus L.). *Vegetable Science*, 35(2), 201-202.

Rincón-Rabanales, M., Roubik, D.W., Guzmán, M.A., Salvador-Figueroa, M., Adriano-Anaya, L. & Ovando, I. (2015). High yields and bee pollination of hermaphroditic rambutan (Nephelium lappaceum L.) in Chiapas, Mexico. *Fruits*, 70, 23–27.

Schurr, L., Masotti, V., Geslin, B., Gachet, S., Mahé, P., Jeannerod, L., *et al.* (2022). To what extent is fennel crop dependent on insect pollination? *Agric Ecosyst Environ*, 338.

Srivastava, K., Sharma, D., Pandey, S. D., Anal, A. K. D., & Nath, V. (2017). Dynamics of climate and pollinator species influencing litchi (Litchi chinensis) in India. *Indian J. Agric. Sci.*, 87, 266-269.

Stein, K., Coulibaly, D., Stenchly, K., Goetze, D., Porembski, S., Lindner, A., *et al.* (2017). Bee pollination increases yield quantity and quality of cash crops in Burkina Faso, West Africa. *Sci Rep*, 7.

Stougaard, B. (1983). Pollination in Rosa multiflora. Tidsskr. Planteavl, 87, 633-642.

Tesfaye, B., Gelgelu, T. & Lelisa, W. (2020). The role of honeybee (Apis mellifera) pollination in enhancing seed yield and yield related parameters of Coriandrum sativum L. *J. Energy Nat. Resour.*, 9, 120.

Toivonen, M., Karimaa, A.E., Herzon, I. & Kuussaari, M. (2022). Flies are important pollinators of mass-flowering caraway and respond to landscape and floral factors differently from honeybees. *Agric Ecosyst Environ*, 323.

Vanlalhmangaiha, R., Singh, H.K., Boopathi, T., Lalhruaitluangi, S. & Sangma, T.T. (2021). Impact of insect pollination on the quantitative and qualitative characteristics of sweet orange, Citrus sinensis (L.) Osbeck. *J Apic Res*, 1–9.

Vaz, C.G., de Oliveira, D. & Ohashi, O.S. (1998). Pollinator contribution to the production of cowpea in the Amazon. *HortScience*, 33.

Verde, G. lo & la Mantia, T. (2011). The role of native flower visitors in pollinating Opuntia ficus-indica (L.) Mill., naturalized in Sicily. *Acta Oecol.*, 37, 413–417.

Williams, I.H. & Free, J.B. (1975). The pollination and set of the early flowers of runner bean (Phaseolus coccineus L.). *J. hort. Sci.*, 50, 405–413.

Williams, I.H., Simpkins, J.R. & Martin, A.P. (1991). Effect of insect pollination on seed production in linseed (Linum usitatissimum). *J. Agr.l Sci., Cambridge*, 117, 75–79.