ISBN: 978-81-19149-80-3

8. Impact of Climate Change on Insect Pollinators

Kanchan Kadawla

PhD Research Scholar,
Department of Entomology, College of Agriculture,
Chaudhary Charan Singh Haryana Agricultural University,
Hisar, Haryana, India.

Surender Singh Yadav

Assistant Director (Plant Protection) Directorate of Research,
Chaudhary Charan Singh Haryana Agricultural University,
Hisar, Haryana, India.

Deependra Kumar Saini

PhD Research Scholar,
Department of Entomology, Rajesthan College of Agriculture,
Maharana Pratap University of Agriculture and Technology,
Udaipur, Rajesthan, India.

Aradhana Panda

PhD Research Scholar,
Faculty of Agriculture,
Sher-e-Kashmir University of Agricultural Sciences and Technology,
Wadura, Kashmir, India.

Abstract:

The weather on Earth has significantly changed as a result of climate change. The weather's natural cycles, animal behaviours, and flower blooming have all been altered by climate change. Pollinators, who are already struggling to survive, are one of the most severely damaged populations by climate change.

Due to climate change, the physiology of flowering plants gets impacted, decision of the flowering time gets hampered, flower size changes, timing of anthesis get disturbed, the scent, pollen and nectar production starts to decline, height of the plant becomes less attractive to the pollinator as a result of which pollinator's foragers activity, size of their body at maturity stage and life span starts to hinder. Thus, it is very important to conserve pollinators for maintaining healthy ecosystem.

Keywords:

Climate, Plant, Pollinators, Interaction, Flower, Phenology

8.1 Introduction:

Insect pollinators are being significantly impacted by global change. The range, phenology, abundance, physiology, and morphology of those insects pollinating plants in both wild and agricultural ecosystems are changing as a repercussion of changing climate, the introduction of species which are exotic, and loss of habitat. These impacts have complicated after effects in interactions of plant and pollinator in subtle but significant ways, sometimes leading to local extinction. Understanding these implications is crucial despite their complexity since we rely heavily on the insect population to croosbreed our plants, a crucial ecological service, just as the majority of flowering plants do. The pollinator insect species which have been studied the most in relation to climate change among the many insect taxa are Bees, flies, butterflies and moths. Bees are dominant pollinators of not only crop plants but also wild species within these groupings, and research on bees has dominated the body of knowledge on interaction of plant and pollinator under changing climate. Since bees laboriously reckon on resources of flower for their own nourishment and that of their young ones, the fitness of bees is substantially influenced not only by the direct reactions of global change but also by the affected global change operators on flower producing plants. I take into account both impacts that have a direct impact on pollinators as well as ones which are arbitrated via plant crops and other interspecific interactions throughout. To better conservation and management of pollination services, it is necessary to know about how global change affects species relationships more thoroughly because biotic pollination is a multitrophic interaction.

Climate Change refers to short-term observations of the local climate spanning hours and weeks, climate refers to long-term weather averages. Given that climate data is compiled over decades, centuries, and even millennia, it is far more challenging for humans to comprehend climate. Therefore, over a long period of time, severe deviations from the usual in the global weather patterns have been recorded as a result of climate change. Scientists can tell whether a summer was drier or wetter than average by comparing it to a summer that occurred decades before in the same region. More severe effects of climate change can be seen right away; For instance, storms like Hurricane Harvey, which struck in late summer 2017, were intensified by warmer ocean waters and caused greater damage than in the past. Climate change has had a significant negative influence on people all around the world since the seasons' weather is now more intense than it used to be. While winter is lasting longer with more storms and blizzards in certain places, summer has gotten drier and hotter in others. As the severe, unpredictable weather has grown more frequent than it once was, humans have had a difficult time adapting to these changes. It becomes much more obvious why a more delicate group, such as pollinators, are having enormous difficulties coping and surviving, as a more flexible and hardy species like humans are having difficulty in adapting to climate change. Numerous species are being impacted by climate change in different ways (Walther et al., 2002; Parmesan, 2006). For many species, the timing of life history events is changing as a result of global warming (Root et al., 2003). Many plants are blooming earlier, the larvae of insects are moulting into adults earlier, and certain the species of bird are laying their eggs untimely (Hughes, 2000). The dispensation of both animal and plant species are changing as a result of global warming, which also advances numerous phenological phenomena. For instance, butterfly ranges are moving northward and treelines are gradually getting higher (Hughes, 2000).

While studies on how climate warming affects species' ranges and phenologies have increased recently (Cleland *et al*., 2012), research on how warming directly affects an organism's physiological processes has lagged (Forrest and Miller-Rushing, 2010). The studies which have been performed recently on plants which produce flowers and pollinating insects show this deviation.

Most part of this study has been on changes which occur in time of flowering and emergence of insect and potential temporal mismatches between the two. (Memmott *et al*., 2007). Direct physiological effects, in contrast, have received very little attention in the literature despite the fact that they are expected to have significant influence on the interactions between plants and pollinators.

Pollinator interactions with flowering plants are both ecologically significant and economically valuable. According to Ollerton *et al*. (2011), angiosperms (88%) contingent on animals for favour of pollination.

If this relationship will not occur, seed distribution, and plant recruitment may all be negatively impacted (Kearns and Inouye, 1997). According to Gallai *et al*. (2009), the profit that pollinators provide is estimated at $220 billion per annum globally. According to Potts *et al*. (2010), a number of interrelated reasons have likely contributed to the global loss of some insect pollinators, and corresponding lessens in insect-pollinated plants have also been perceived (Biesmeijer *et al*., 2006). Therefore, it is crucial to comprehend how physiological changes in the environment affect pollinators, their floral supplies, and their mutualistic relationships.

According to several studies, elevated temperatures have a variety of effects on the physiology of flowering plants, resulting in altered production of flowers, nectar, and pollen. Warming can affect an insect pollinator's foraging behaviour, body size, and lifespan (Bosch *et al*., 2000).

Individual flowering plants or insect pollinators may not directly suffer from the physiological effects of climatic warming; in some cases, they may even benefit. However, these physiological reactions may in turn have conflicting implications on how pollinators and plants interact. There hasn't been a synthesis of these physiological reactions or their possible effects on interactions between plants and pollinators as of yet.

Here, we provide a summary of the current understanding of how high temperatures affect the biology of plants produces flowers and pollinating insects. Physiology of plants and insects can be impacted by other components of intercontinental changing in climate, like inflated levels of carbon dioxide and changed patterns of precipitation (Minckley *et al*., 2013), either directly or indirectly (Hoover *et al*., 2012). We first consider how plant physiological responses to warming may impact insect pollinators, then we consider how insect reactions to warming may impact flowering plants, and finally we consider how these responses may impact networks of interactions between plants and pollinators. Our objective is to both summarise what is currently known about the biological repurcussions of warming on every partner which are giving benefits to each other and to suggest fruitful lines of inquiry for further study in this area.

8.2 Physiological Impacts on Cross Breeding Plants and Plausible Repucussions on Pollinating Insects:

The physiology of flowering plants can be impacted by increased temperatures in a number of different ways. Here, we concentrate on physiological factors that could affect how plants interact with pollinating insects. Many insect taxa reckon on flower resources, mainly pollen, to cater for their eggs and developing offspring as well as in sometimes, to keep themselves alive during overwintering. According to Kevan and Baker, 1983, the numerous insect taxa that consume nectar out of flowers to propellant their flight and/or metabolic activity

8.2.1 Decision to Flower and Flower Production:

It has been discovered that elevated temperatures have a variety of consequences on flower output. Some plants may flower less frequently or produce fewer flowers when grown in hotter temperatures. In an investigation on *Delphinium nuttallianum,* Nuttall's larkspur, it was discovered that the experimentally heated plots had less flower reproducing plants unheated plots under control. According to the same investigation (3.94 vs. 4.53 flowers/plant; Saavedra *et al.*, 2003), plants in warm plots had on average fewer flowers than plants in control plots. Similar to this, numerous species' flower production declined as a result of a research trial that replicated winter warming of plant species by 1.5 °C on the Tibetan plateau (Liu *et al*., 2012).

According to Menzel and Simpson (1995), lychee (*Litchi chinensis*) plants that were revealed to temperatures above 20 °C for at least eight hours a day failed to blossom. On the other hand, research on alpine tundra and arctic dwelling plants revealed that, following a few years of investigation warming, the plants' blooming productivity rose (Arft *et al.*, 1999). Many New Zealand species experienced an increase in mass flowering as an outcome of inflating temperatures (Schauber *et al.*, 2002). The conflicting results of climate change on flower growth imply that certain breeds are impacted by inflated temperatures, where others are not. Species those reckon on temperature cues to command flowering, in general, had greater potential to adjust in high temperatures. (Cleland *et al*., 2012).

The reason of this may be a transcription factor ehich activates flowering at warmer temperatures (Kumar *et al*., 2012), and warming may also be beneficial for species whose growth is more dependent on the availability of nitrogen than water (De Valpine and Harte, 2001). Species' ability to produce floral resources for insect visitors and the level of pollinator attraction to those plants will depend on whether and how intensely they blossom. Reduced food availability due to increased temperatures would almost likely result in decreased flower production, which might then lead to decreased insect pollinator reproductive output (Minckley *et al.*, 1994) and density of pollination (Westphal *et al*., 2003). As an alternative, if floral resources are limited, the pollinators of those plants that produce more flowers in response to warming may have access to more food and experience population growth. Regardless of substitute in absolute abundance, the species mix of plants in flower will probably alter, which may have an impact on pasturing distances (Jha and Kremen, 2013) and growth of larvae (Génissel *et al*., 2002).

8.2.2 Flower Size and Timing of Anthesis:

When plants give production to flowers in hot conditions, it's likely that those blossoms will vary in a number of crucial characteristics that could alter how appealing, reachable, and beneficial their rewards would be for insect visitors. The results of all the investigations done up to this point indicate a wide range of biological repurcussions of temperature on flower features, the process for which probably reckon on part on whether and at what developmental stages plants encounter heat stress (Wahid *et al*., 2007) which means temperature has an impact on the size of each individual bloom. Pumpkin plants, *Cucurbita maxima* that were experimentally warmed (to 23 °C) produced blooms that reduced in diameter (Hoover *et al*., 2012). The length of corolla tubes from the shore flowers of *Ipomoea trichocarpa* produced during cooler time were several millimetres shorter than flowers produced during a warmer period. The timing of anthesis was similarly influenced by temperature, with the opening of flowers 2-3 hours earlier on warmer mornings (Murcia, 1990). The ability of pollinators to access floral resources from a particular species may be impacted by these temperature-related alterations in flower size and timing of anthesis. According to morphological correlations between the extent of proboscides and nectar spurs (Nilsson, 1988), it is known that floral dimensions specifically affect those pollinators which are physically able to access floral rewards.

Changes in floral dimensions may have an impact on pollinator’s foraging effectiveness even if rewards are still available. Pollinator species that are working earlier may gain from access to those incentives if the anthesis process occurs more quickly as a result of warmer morning temperatures, but this could change the accessibility of resources for pollinator taxa operating at the end of the day. (Murcia, 1990). It is also important to remember that the size of flower can influence the pollinator appeal (Totland, 2001).

8.2.3 Floral Scent, Nectar, and Pollen Production:

Temperature can also have an impact on floral smell, nectar, and pollen production. Although some investigations have suggested that endogenous floral smell production diminishes with increasing temperature (Sagae *et al*., 2008), hot temperatures may intensify emissions and/or fickleness of organic chemicals manufactured by flowers (Yuan *et al*., 2009). Despite the fact that Pacini *et al*. (2003) demonstrated that nectar production, composition, and concentration of flower, all are affected by temperature, it appears that not many research have looked upon these issues in the context of global warming. In a Mediterranean plant, *Thymus capitatus*, nectar volume and sugar concentration rose with temperature (38°C) (Petanidou and Smets, 1996), even though the proportion of glucose to fructose in the nectar of plants of pumpkin was negatively altered by temperature (23 °C vs. 19 °C), (Hoover *et al.*, 2012).

Compared to plants grown at a constant temperature of 25 °C. The plants of Medicago sativa revealed to temperature fluctuations (18 to 32 °C) bring out less nectar (57.1 vs. 68.4 l/100 florets; Walker *et al*., 1974). The performance and chemical makeup of pollen can also be impacted by temperature (Delph *et al.*, 1997). Glycine max soybean flowers generated 30-50% less pollen which was less likely to germinate when grown at high temperatures (38 °C Day, 30 °C night) (Koti *et al.*, 2005). Similar to this, when exposed to high temperature, *Arachis hypogaea* plants generated fewer viable pollen (up to 44 °C) (Prasad *et al*., 2003). These swap in floral fragrance and benefits may have an impact on the likelihood that insects will visit particular flowers and the rewards they receive. The detectability of flowers may be impacted by substituted odour of flower outpouring or volatilization at temperatures at higher rate (Kevan and Baker, 1983), especially for crossbreeding insects, eg. moths that reckon on long distance cues to collect flower resources (Yuan *et al*., 2009).

Without a doubt, substitutes in production and composition of nectar could have an instant bump on activity of pollinators and energetics as well as longer-term allusions on pollinator fitness (Burkle and Irwin, 2009) for insects those depend on nectar for both carbohydrates and amino acids, such as some lepidopterans and wasps (Kevan and Baker, 1983).

The reproductive success of many bees is also likely to be impacted by decreasing pollen production, as these insects may need to collect pollen from numerous plants in order to effectively nurture their young-ones. (Muller *et al*., 2006).

In spite of the fact that, there has not been much cessation research on whether less viable pollen is fewer or many appealing to pollinators. Bumblebees favoured potato *Solanum tuberosum* flowers with viable pollen grains over those with inviable or shrunken pollen grains, showing the former are more nutrient-rich (Batra, 1993).

8.2.4 Plant Height:

Elevated temperatures can change various plant properties that could affect insect pollinators' visits and floral attributes. For instance, plant communities subjected to 1.5 °C of winter warming via open top chambers grew to a greater height than communities in control chambers (Liu *et al*., 2012). With contradiction to this, *Silene noctiflora* plants get taller at higher temperatures (28°C Day, 24°C night) were several cm minuscule (Qaderi and Reid, 2008) similarly, *Hypericum perforatum* plants uncovered to 3°C winter warming was shorter (Fox *et al*., 1999); showing that species-specific effects of temperature on plant height may reckon on the accessibility of water and other resources.

The likelihood that insects may come across and visit flowers may change as a result of changes in plant stature. Indeed, plants having tall height are generally anticipated to draw more visits of pollinator, and some pollinating insects are known to evinced height-specific habits of feeding (Levin and Kerster, 1973). As a result, shorter plants may be harder for pollinators to spot (Aspi *et al*., 2003), which could alter how much time and effort they need to spend finding these floral resources.

8.3 Pollinating Insects' Physiological Reactions and Possible Implications for Blossoming Plants:

As a direct result of climate change, pollinators are also subjected to several alterations. The impact of changing temperatures on the physiology of several important pollinators has comparatively less studied. Instead, we focus on what we already know about the ecology of temperature of insect pollinators and in what way this can have an impact on how successfully flowering plants are pollinated.

8.3.1 Foraging Activity:

The pollinators which can be active when the temperature is high is determined by thermoregulatory constraints (Willmer and Stone, 2004). Pollinating insects of varying sizes are likely to be affected by warming in a different way as bigger insects are effectively having potential to maintain their temperatures of body in comparison to the ones having smaller size. The likelihood of overheating is inflated because big-bodied insects may engross more heat and do not liberate it rapidly (Heinrich, 1993). In fact, Asian honey bees overall body size was inversely associated with passive convective heat loss through the thorax. (Dyer and Seeley, 1987). Insects' ability to regulate their body temperature can also be influenced by colour and pile or fur thickness (Willmer, 1983). Under hotter conditions, daily activity patterns and timing of insect pollinators can change due to the thermal restrictions. Eg. Honey bees, *A. mellifera* found in Sonoran Desert ceasing to browse at temperatures which exceeds 40 °C for collecting pollen (Cooper *et al.*, 1985), while larger insects, such as *Bombus* spp., be liabled to feed either very early in the morning or at the end of the day, circumvent the warmest time of the day. (Willmer, 1983).

Pollination success is likely to be impacted if climate change obtruded new physiological restraints on the discernible patterns of diurnal pollinating insects that change the time of day, they select to browse flowers. These changes are likely to have an impact on pollen flow patterns, that pollen will be received, and pollination will be successful if pollinators only visit flowers that open earlier in the day, plants with later-opening blooms would receive fewer visits, which would lead to a reduction in seed and fruit production (Wilcock and Neiland, 2002).

Pollen flow patterns may change as a result of when pollinators have to restrain their foraging browsing to shorter distances to prevent overheating during flight on extremely hot days. Reduced outcross pollen from more distant conspecifics could occur as a result of shorter flight distances, which could impair seed germination and seedling survival (Price and Waser, 1979). Similar to this, plants might be pollinated more- or less-effectively, if everyday's temperature analyse the constituents of sternous floral visitors on the basis of intra- or inter-specific differences in body size (Herrera, 1997).

8.3.2 Body Size at Maturity:

The tendency of ectotherms, which include insects, to generate adults that are smaller in size as they develop at higher temperatures is a well-known phenomenon (King-solver and Huey, 2008). This phenomenon may be due to the acceleration of development. According to several research, higher temperatures (both constant and changing) cause solitary bee larvae or pupae to weigh less, developing into adults of small size (Radmacher and Strohm, 2010; 2011). With increased temperatures of 20, 25, and 30 °C, the size of larval stage of tobacco hornworm, *Manduca sexta* shrank (Davidowitz *et al*., 2004), which would produce smaller adult hawkmoths. (Kingsolver *et al*., 2012).

The efficiency of pollinators can differ with their body size (Sahli and Conner, 2007), so warming persuaded changes in developmental physiology that produces smaller adult pollinators could ameliorate or reduce pollen impregnation to female flowers and there upon hampered per-visit setting of seed, capably altering the expense and well-being of pollinator visits. According to the results showed by Greenleaf *et al*. (2007), bee body size has also been connected to foraging distance, with larger bees covering longer distances. Smaller pollinators may carry pollen farther if the similar relationship exists within the species.

8.3.3 Life Span:

Increasing temperature may shorten the life span of pollinating insects. For instance, the average number of days that male orange sulphur butterflies, *Colias eurytheme* life span decreased by about 40% when they were exposed to 4°C "warming" episode in the half of their "normal" temperature cycle of 20 to 32°C (Kingsolver and Watt, 1983). Bees that had overwintered lived shorter lives, as a result of imitated prolonged summers and sizeable degree-day cimulations encountered by the solitary bee, *Osmia lignaria* (Sgolastra *et al*., 2011). Similar to this, this species' adult life span was shortened by up to several days when exposed to persistently high pre-winter temperatures (Bosch *et al*., 2000).

The window of time during which certain pollinators may collect pollen and remove it from plants is fundamentally decreased due to their shorter life spans. For plants, those are non-autogamous and reckon on just some breeds of pollinators during a small period of flowering could produce harmful effect. The majority of plants, however, do not fit into this group because they possess compensating characteristics that can guarantee reproduction even in the absence of pollinator visitation. Discrete plants those produces flower outside of the window of overlap with efficacious pollinators may have lower reproductive output.

8.4 Consequences for Plant-Pollinator Networks:

Both, the pair wise relationships and their overall interaction networks will change as a result of the integrated effects of heat on flowering plants and insect pollinators. Many researchers have studied the anatomy and passage of networks of plant-pollinators (Olesen *et al*., 2008), and some have looked into how these networks may react to disruptions like phenological shifts brought by climate change (Memmott *et al*., 2007) and shifts in the ranges (Devoto *et al*., 2007). Latest empirical work demonstrates that when generalization and the emergence of new interactions can act as some buffers, species extinction and phenological incompatibilities can eventually damage networks. (Burkle *et al*., 2013).

Even without alterations to the species composition or phenological overlap, physiological reactions to warming may be able to affect the networks of plants and pollinators. Network structure and dynamics may be considerably impacted by the additional unpretentious changes in contact strength that could make an appearance from changed floral reward quality or shorter pollinator life spans. Positive assessment between effects on pollinator and plant populations are also likely, even though we have briefly explored them. For example, direct plant physiological responses that decreased pollinator reproductive success may in turn reduce pollination success. On the other hand, if plant and pollinator responses are complementary, both anthesis and foraging occur promt in the day or both flower size and body size are smaller, then there may not be much of an overall impact on interactions. Even if a brred reactions are not so much directed and more changeable, new interactions might develop, preventing the network as a whole from becoming too unstable.

Ultimately, though, physiological reactions to climate warming may have an impact on networks in a lot of the same ways that more pronounced phenological shifts with some plant species being visited by fewer pollinator species and reduced diet breadths for some pollinators.

8.5 Impact of Different Climate Factors on Bee Populations:

Colony collapse disorder (CCD) is a phenomenan that poses a risk to bees in particular. An article from Oregon State University describes CCD: "CCD is most likely caused by a number of issues related to agricultural beekeeping, including as infections, nutritional inadequacies and a lack of variety in diet, exposure to pesticides and neonicotinoid insecticides, a lack of genetic diversity, habitat degradation, and transportation stress. In fact, pesticides, stress, and a lack of diversity can make bees more susceptible to infections. Habitat loss, nutritional inadequacies, and a lack of variety in diet are all closely linked to climate change due to which the irregular weather affects plant and flower growth. Flowers are blossoming half a day earlier each year due to climate change, which means that plants are currently in full bloom one month earlier than they were 45 years ago. Early blooming plants ultimately result in less pollination, which leaves bees hungry.

Humans will continue to notice the effects of CCD on their plants and crops as long as bee colonies are suffering from it. Green Living Ideas, the website showed the importance of pollination in NEFT reports by stating that all the billions of humans living on earth heavily rely on food and products for their survival, thus those 1,000 plants which helps us to achieve that survival has to be inseminated by animals, which counts coffee, almonds, some delicious snacks like melon, and also tequila. Bees are responsible for over 75% of the pollination of the plants in our yards. Humans would experience severe food shortages, serious economic ramifications, and the tragic fallout of bee extinction if this dreadful trend of CCD persists.

8.6 How Can We Conserve Pollinators:

Plant a wide range of native flowers and plants to your environment that are good for pollinators. Pesticides are dangerous to pollinators, so stop using them on your property or use them sparingly. Establish a bee-friendly environment. This entails either putting beehives on your property, leaving dead logs lying around that bees may nest in, or simply making sure that your yard is filled with plenty of flora that are beneficial to bees. Plant milkweed plants so that monarch butterflies can feast on the nectar of the blooms and lay their eggs on the leaves.

8.7 Conclusions:

A challenging and crucial conservation objective for the coming decades is the preservation of of interaction between plant and pollinator because of continuous climate change. Although scientists have made progress in documenting how warming affects various plant and pollinator species physiologically, there is still a lot of space for advancement in this area of study. Studies that more truly account for the effects of warming might provide useful insights as investigation on the repercussions of changing climate on plant and pollinator physiology advances. Simulations that take into cogitation, thermal variability in landscapes and microclimatic change at scales relevant for focal organisms, are likely to more effectively predict the impacts of climate warming (Sears *et al*., 2011). Our understanding of the overall effects of global change on plant-pollinator interactions should also be improved by research that combine physiological, behavioural, and phenological responses as well as interactions among different drivers (Hoover *et al.*, 2012).

Studies at the network level in some ways inherently achieve this goal, mainly if networks are sampled throughout space and time. Greater cogitation of species attributes and abiotic factors in network research would be particularly beneficial in assisting with the solution to this topic. The only way to put the unique physiological reactions of each benifitting partner to each other into a broader ecological framework and comprehend the overall impact on focal species is to study interactions.

8.8 References:

1. Aarssen LW. Hypotheses for the evolution of apical dominance in plants: implications for the interpretation of over-compensation. *Oikos*. 1995; 74:149–156.
2. Arft AM, Walker MD, Gurevitch J, Alatalo JM, Bret-Harte MS, Responses of tundra plants to experimental warming: Meta-analysis of the international tundra experiment. *Ecol. Monogr*. 1999; 69:491–511.
3. Aspi J, Jäkäläniemi A, Tuomi J, Siikamäki P. Multilevel phenotypic selection on morphological characters in a meta-population of Silene tatarica. *Evolution.* 2003; 57:509–517.
4. Batra SWT. Male-fertile potato flowers are selectively buzz-pollinated only by Bombus terricola Kirby in upstate New York. J. Kansas Entomol. Soc. 1993; 66:252–254.
5. Biesmeijer JC, Roberts SPM, Reemer M, Ohlemuller R, Edwards M, et al. Parallel declines in pollinators and insect-pollinated plants in Britain and the Netherlands. *Science*. 2006; 313:351–354.
6. Bosch J, Kemp WP, Peterson SS. Management of *Osmia lignaria* (Hymenoptera: Megachilidae) populations for almond pollination: methods to advance bee emergence. *Environ. Entomol*. 2000; 29:874–883.
7. Burkle L, Irwin R. Nectar sugar limits larval growth of solitary bees (Hymenoptera: Megachilidae) *Environ. Entomol*. 2009; 38:1293–1300.
8. Burkle LA, Marlin JC, Knight TM. Plant-pollinator interactions over 120 years: Loss of species, co-occurrences, and function. *Science*.
9. Cleland EE, Allen JM, Crimmins TM, Dunne JA, Pau S, et al. Phenological tracking enables positive species responses to climate change. *Ecology*. 2012; 93:1765–1771.
10. Cooper PD, Schaffer WM, Buchmann SL. Temperature regulation of honey bees Apis mellifera foraging in the Sonoran Desert. *J. Exp. Biol*. 1985; 114:1–15.
11. Davidowitz G, D'Amico LJ, Nijhout HF. The effects of environmental variation on a mechanism that controls insect body size. *Evol. Ecol. Research*. 2004; 6:49–62.
12. Delph LF, Johannsson MH, Stephenson AG. How environmental factors affect pollen performance: Ecological and evolutionary perspectives. *Ecology*. 1997; 78:1632–1639.
13. Devoto M, Zimmermann M, Medan D. Robustness of plant-flower visitor webs to simulated climate change. *Ecol. Austral*. 2007; 17:37–50.
14. Dyer FC, Seeley TD. Interspecific comparisons of endothermy in honey-bees (Apis): Deviations from the expected size-related patterns. *J. Exp. Biol*. 1987; 127:1–26.

15. Forrest J, Miller-Rushing AJ. Toward a synthetic understanding of the role of phenology in ecology and evolution. *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. B.* 2010; 365:3101–3112.
16. Fox LR, Ribeiro SP, Brown VK, Masters GJ, Clarke IP. Direct and indirect effects of climate change on St John's wort Hypericum perforatum L. (Hypericaceae) Oecologia. 1999; 120:113–122.
17. Erhardt A, Rusterholz H-P. Effects of elevated CO2 on flowering phenology and nectar production. *Acta Oecologica*. 1997; 18:249–253. [Google Scholar]
18. Gallai N, Salles J-M, Settele J, Vaissiere BE. Economic valuation of the vulnerability of world agriculture confronted with pollinator decline. *Ecol. Econ*. 2009; 68:810–821.
19. Génissel A, Aupinel P, Bressac C, Tasei J-N, Chevrier C. Influence of pollen origin on performance of Bombus terrestris micro-colonies. *Entomol. Exp. Appl*. 2002; 104:329–336.
20. Greenleaf SS, Williams NM, Winfree R, Kremen C. Bee foraging ranges and their relationship to body size. *Oecologia.* 2007; 153:589–596.
21. Heinrich B. The Hot-blooded Insects: Strategies and Mechanisms of Thermoregulation. Harvard Univ. Press; Cambridge, MA: 1993.
22. Herrera CM. Components of pollinator "quality": Comparative analysis of a diverse insect assemblage. *Oikos*. 1987; 50:79–90.
23. Herrera CM. Thermal biology and foraging responses of insect pollinators to the forest floor irradiance mosaic. *Oikos*. 1997; 78:601–611.
24. Hoover SER, Ladley JJ, Shchepetkina AA, Tisch M, Gieseg SP, et al. Warming, CO2, and nitrogen deposition interactively affect a plant-pollinator mutualism. *Ecol. Lett*. 2012; 15:227–234.
25. Hughes L. Biological consequences of global warming: Is the signal already apparent? *Trends Ecol. Evol.* 2000; 15:56–61.
26. Jha S, Kremen C. Resource diversity and landscape-level homogeneity drive native bee foraging. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A. 2013; 110:555–558.
27. Kearns CA, Inouye DW. Pollinators, flowering plants, and conservation biology. Bioscience. 1997; 47:297–307.
28. Kevan PG, Baker HG. Insects as flower visitors and pollinators. *Annu. Rev. Entomol*. 1983; 28:407–453.
29. Kingsolver JG, Watt WB. Thermoregulatory strategies in Colias butterflies: Thermal stress and the limits to adaptation in temporally varying environments. *Am. Nat.* 1983; 121:32–55.
30. Kingsolver JG, Huey RB. Size, temperature, and fitness: Three rules. *Evol. Ecol. Research*. 2008; 10:251–268.
31. Kingsolver JG, Diamond SE, Seiter SA, Higgins JK. Direct and indirect phenotypic selection on developmental trajectories in Manduca sexta. *Funct. Ecol*. 2012; 26:598–607.
32. Kumar SV, Lucyshyn D, Jaeger KE, Alós E, Alvey E, et al. Transcription factor PIF4 controls the thermosensory activation of flowering. *Nature*. 2012; 484:242–245.
33. Levin DA, Kerster HW. Assortative pollination for stature in *Lythrum salicaria*. Evolution. 1973; 27:144–152.
34. Liu Y, Mu J, Niklas KJ, Li G, Sun S. Global warming reduces plant reproductive output for temperate multi-inflorescence species on the Tibetan plateau. *New Phytol*. 2012; 195:427–436.
35. Memmott J, Craze PG, Waser NM, Price MV. Global warming and the disruption of plant-pollinator interactions. *Ecol. Lett*. 2007; 10:710–717.

36. Menzel CM, Simpson DR. Temperatures above 20 °C reduce flowering in lychee (*Litchi chinensis* Sonn.) J. *Hortic. Sci*. 1995; 70:981–987.
37. Minckley RL, Wcislo WT, Yanega D, Buchmann SL. Behavior and phenology of a specialist bee (Dieunomia) and sunflower (Helianthus) pollen availability. *Ecology*. 1994; 75:1406–1419.
38. Minckley RL, Roulston TH, Williams NM. Resource assurance predicts specialist and generalist bee activity in drought. *Proc. R. Soc. B*. 2013; 280:20122703.
39. Muller A, Diener S, Schnyder S, Stutz K, Sedivy C, Quantitative pollen requirements of solitary bees: Implications for bee conservation and the evolution of bee-flower relationships. *Biol. Conserv*. 2006; 130:604–615.
40. Murcia C. Effect of floral morphology and temperature on pollen receipt and removal in Ipomoea trichocarpa. Ecology. 1990; 71:1098–1109.
41. Nilsson LA. The evolution of flowers with deep corolla tubes. *Nature*. 1988; 334:147–149.
42. Olesen JM, Bascompte J, Elberling H, Jordano P. Temporal dynamics in a pollination network. *Ecology*. 2008; 89:1573–1582.
43. Ollerton J, Winfree R, Tarrant S. How many flowering plants are pollinated by animals. Oikos. 2011; 120:321–326.
44. Pacini E, Nepi M, Vesprini JL. Nectar biodiversity: A short review. *Plant Syst. Evol*. 2003; 238:7–21.
45. Parmesan C. Ecological and evolutionary responses to recent climate change. *Annu. Rev. Ecol. Evol. Syst*. 2006; 37:637–69.
46. Potts SG, Biesmeijer JC, Kremen C, Neumann P, Schweiger O, et al. Global pollinator declines: Trends, impacts and drivers. Trends Ecol. *Evol*. 2010; 25:345–353.
47. Price MV, Waser NM. Pollen dispersal and optimal out-crossing in Delphinium nelson. *Nature.* 1979; 277:294–297.
48. Qaderi MM, Reid DM. Combined effects of temperature and carbon dioxide on plant growth and subsequent seed germinability of Silene noctiflora. *Int. J. Plant Sci*. 2008; 169:1200–1209.
49. Radmacher S, Strohm E. Factors affecting offspring body size in the solitary bee. *Osmia bicornis* (Hymenoptera, Megachilidae) Apidologie. 2010; 41:169–177.
50. Root TL, Price JT, Hall KR, Schneider SH, Rosenzweig C, Fingerprints of global warming on wild animals and plants. *Nature*. 2003; 421:57–60.
51. Sagae M, Oyama-Okubo N, Ando T, Marchesi E, Nakayama M. Effect of temperature on the scent emission and endogenous volatile profile of Petunia axillaris. *Biosci. Biotechnol. Biochem*. 2008; 72:110–115.
52. Sears MW, Raskin E, Angilletta MJ. The world is not flat: Defining relevant thermal landscapes in the context of climate change. *Integr. Comp. Biol*. 2011; 51:666–675.
53. Sgolastra F, Kemp WP, Buckner JS, Pitts-Singer TL, Maini S, et al. The long summer: Pre-wintering temperatures affect metabolic expenditure and winter survival in a solitary bee. *J. Insect Physiol.* 2011; 57:1651–1659.
54. Totland O. Environment-dependent pollen limitation and selection on floral traits in an alpine species. *Ecology*. 2001; 82:2233–2244.
55. De Valpine P, Harte J. Plant responses to experimental warming in an montane meadow. *Ecology*. 2001; 82:637–648.
56. Wahid A, Gelani S, Ashraf M, Foolad MR. Heat tolerance in plants: An overview. *Environ. Exp. Bot*. 2007; 61:199–223.

57. Walker AK, Barnes DK, Furgala B. Genetic and environmental effects on quantity and quality of alfalfa nectar. *Crop Sci*. 1974; 14:235–238.
58. Walther G-R, Post E, Convey P, Menzel A, Parmesan C, et al. Ecological responses to recent climate change. *Nature.* 2002; 416:389–395.
59. Westphal C, Steffan-Dewenter I, Tscharntke T. Mass flowering crops enhance pollinator densities at a landscape scale. *Ecol. Lett*. 2003; 6:961–965.
60. Wilcock C, Neiland R. Pollination failure in plants: Why it happens and when it matters. Trends Plant Sci. 2002; 7:270–277.
61. Willmer PG. Thermal constraints on activity patterns in nectar-feeding insects. *Ecol. Entomol*. 1983; 8:455–469.
62. Willmer PG, Stone GN. Behavioral, ecological, and physiological determinants of the activity patterns of bees. *Adv. Stud. Behav*. 2004; 34:347–466.
63. Yuan JS, Himanen SJ, Holopainen JK, Chen F, Stewart CN. Smelling global climate change: Mitigation of function for plant volatile organic compounds. *Trends Ecol. Evol*. 2009; 24:323–331.