

[Click here to view linked References](#)

Reproductive phenologies of phyllostomid bats in the Central Amazon

Quentin C.K. Hazard^{1*}, Joana Sabino-Pinto², Adrià López-Baucells^{3,4}, Fábio Z. Farneda^{3,5}, Christoph F. J. Meyer^{3,6}, Ricardo Rocha^{1,3,8}

¹CIBIO, Centro de Investigação em Biodiversidade e Recursos Genéticos, InBIO Laboratório Associado, Campus de Vairão, Universidade do Porto, Vairão, Portugal

²*GELIFES* — Groningen Institute for Evolutionary Life Sciences, University of Groningen, Groningen, The Netherlands

³Biological Dynamics of Forest Fragments Project, National Institute for Amazonian Research and Smithsonian Tropical Research Institute, Manaus, Brazil

⁴Natural Sciences Museum of Granollers, Granollers, Spain

⁵Department of Forest Sciences, National University of Colombia, Medellín, Colombia

⁶School of Science, Engineering and Environment, University of Salford, Salford, United Kingdom

⁷CIBIO, Centro de Investigação em Biodiversidade e Recursos Genéticos, InBIO Laboratório Associado, Instituto Superior de Agronomia, Universidade de Lisboa, Lisboa, Portugal

⁸BIOPOLIS Program in Genomics, Biodiversity and Land Planning, CIBIO, Campus de Vairão, Vairão, Portugal

* Corresponding author: quentin.hazard.34@gmail.com

ORCID of the author(s)

Quentin C.K. Hazard: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4767-5190>

Joana Sabino-Pinto: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4737-5665>

Adrià López-Baucells: <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-8446-0108>

Fábio Z. Farneda: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6765-2861>

Christoph F. J. Meyer: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9958-8913>

Ricardo Rocha: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2757-7347>

Abstract

Mammals tend to align their most energetically demanding phenological events with periods of peak resource availability. Their reproductive phenology is influenced by local resource availability, potentially leading to geographical variation in their breeding strategy. Although the Amazon is the world's epicenter of bat diversity, the reproductive phenology of Amazonian bats remains poorly known. Seasonality induces fluctuations in resource availability and most phyllostomid species, crucial agents of seed dispersal, pollination and arthropod suppression in the Neotropics, have been described to exhibit seasonal bimodal polyestry. However, current understanding of phyllostomid reproductive phenology is impaired by the paucity of comparative examinations of the phenologies of sympatric species, using consistent classification schemes based on the number and timing of annual peaks in pregnancy and lactation. Using a multi-year dataset from Central Amazonia, we examined the reproductive phenology of nine bat species (*Artibeus concolor*, *A. obscurus*, *A. lituratus*, *Carollia brevicauda*, *C. perspicillata*, *Gardnerycteris crenulatum*, *Lophostoma silvicolum*, *Rhinophylla pumilio*, and *Trachops cirrhosus*), as well as two feeding ensembles (i.e., frugivores and gleaning animalivores). Only three of the nine species exhibited a bimodal reproductive phenology. Six species and the frugivore ensemble showed unimodal reproductive phenology, while gleaning animalivores displayed an amodal pregnancy pattern. All species except *L. silvicolum* had their primary pregnancy peak during the mid dry season. A reproductive peak during the early wet season, or local variation in the duration of the fruiting season may explain the deviation of our observations from the expected bimodal polyestry.

1
2
3
4 **Keywords:** Chiroptera; Neotropical bats; Phyllostomidae; reproduction; seasonality.
5
6
7
8
9

10 **Acknowledgments**

11
12
13
14
15 We would like to thank the BDFFP management team for logistical support and the multiple
16
17 colleagues, volunteers and field assistants that helped collect data and provided logistic support.
18

19 These include: Jorge M. Palmeirim, Oriol Massana, Diogo F. Ferreira, Marta Acácio, Gilberto
20
21 Fernandez, Milou Groenenberg, Rodrigo Marciente, Madalena Boto, Inês Silva, Julia Treitler,
22
23 Solange Farias, Ubirajara Capaverde Jr., Alaércio Reis, Luiz Queiroz, Josimar Menezes,
24
25
26 Osmaildo Silva, José Tenaçol, Paulo E.D. Bobrowiec, José L.C. Camargo, Rosely Hipólito and
27
28 Ary Jorge Ferreira. This research constitutes publication number XXX in the BDFFP technical
29
30 series.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 **Statements and declarations**

40 41 42 **Funding**

43
44
45 This work was supported by the Portuguese Foundation for Science and Technology under grants
46
47 PTDC/BIABIC/111184/2009 (CFJM), SFRH/BD/80488/2011 and
48
49 2020.01129.CEECIND/CP1601/CT0004 (RR) and PD/BD/52597/2014 (ALB). Additional
50
51 funding was provided by Bat Conservation International to RR and ALB and by ARDITI –
52
53 Madeira’s Regional Agency for the Development of Research, Technology and Innovation (grant
54
55 M1420-09-5369-FSE-000002) to RR.
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Conflict of interest

The authors have nothing to declare.

Ethics approval consent

This research was conducted under ICMBio (Instituto Chico Mendes de Conservação da Biodiversidade) permit (26877-2). All applicable institutional and/or national guidelines for the care and use of animals were followed.

Contribution statement

CM and RR conceived and designed the study. Data collection was performed by RR, ALB, FF and CM. Data analysis was performed by QH and JP. QH wrote the first draft and all authors commented on previous versions of the manuscript. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Consent to participate

Not applicable.

Consent for publication

Not applicable.

Introduction

Phenology - the study of recurrent biological life cycle events – is key for understanding how organisms react to seasonal changes in dynamic environments (Stucky et al. 2018). As most organisms time their reproduction to capitalize on optimal resource abundance, phenology is vital for understanding how population-level dynamics are modulated by environmental cues (Rocha et al. 2017a). This is particularly important in the context of human-induced global change, as phenomena such as climate and land-use change are shifting the timing of vital phenological events (Hällfors et al. 2020).

Reproduction is one of the most energetically demanding aspects of an animal's life cycle (Harshman 2007). The energy budget of small mammals is heavily constrained by the maintenance costs of physiological parameters associated with the regulation of body temperature, body functioning and foraging (Bronson 1985; McNab 1982; Speakman and Thomas 2003). As most small mammals are unable to store large amounts of energy in the form of fat (Bronson 1985), the energetic demands associated with reproduction are therefore counterbalanced by reproducing seasonally, and at times that are likely to increase reproductive success by allowing for increased food intake (Bronson 1985; Kunz et al. 1995). Additionally, during pregnancy and lactation, bats spend most of their flight time foraging (Kurta et al. 1989). This increased flight activity is energetically extremely costly (Thomas 1975), leading to a tight association between most species' reproductive phenology and periods of high resource availability (Racey and Speakman 1987; Kurta et al. 1989; Racey and Entwistle 2000). For female bats, reproductive costs are mostly shared between pregnancy and lactation for which the daily costs can be twice as high as the costs of pregnancy (Kurta et al. 1989; Kunz et al. 1995). As female bats need to increase their food intake to be able to meet these energetic demands (Kunz

1
2
3
4 et al. 1995), food availability is an important determinant of the timing of reproduction
5
6 (Thompson 1992).
7
8

9
10 Throughout the tropics, seasonality is mostly shaped by differences in precipitation and not so
11
12 much by fluctuations in temperature (MacArthur 1984). Seasonal changes in precipitation affect
13
14 plant and animal phenology, causing oscillations in resource availability (Bentos et al. 2008;
15
16 Ramos Pereira et al. 2010), one of the main factors controlling the parturition period in bats
17
18 (Arlettaz et al. 2001). If births were to mismatch peaks of food availability, bat fitness would be
19
20 negatively affected (Ransome 1989). Weaning - a period during which juvenile bats have to
21
22 overcome the double challenge of meeting the energetic demands for growth while learning how
23
24 to independently forage - is critical for juvenile survival (Handley et al. 1991). Thus, in the
25
26 tropics, female bats seem to avoid giving birth too close to the dry season so that weaning can
27
28 occur when resources are plentiful, maximizing the survival chances of the offspring (Willig
29
30 1985). Accordingly, bat reproduction has been observed to match periods of high resource
31
32 abundance (Nurul-Ain et al. 2017; Molinari and Soriano 2014; Mello et al. 2004; Estrada and
33
34 Coates-Estrada 2001; Fleming et al. 1972).
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

42 Phyllostomids are one of the most species-rich and ecologically diverse tropical bat families
43
44 (Fleming et al. 2020; Yoh et al. 2020). The ca. 200 recognized species have evolved to explore a
45
46 wide range of food sources, ranging from fruits, nectar and pollen, to arthropods, small
47
48 vertebrates and blood (Fleming et al. 2020). In the Neotropics, food resources such as insects and
49
50 fruits are available year-round, but their abundance tends to increase during the rainy season and
51
52 with the onset of rains (da Silva et al. 2011; Torres and Madi-Ravazzi 2006; Ramos Pereira et al.
53
54 2010). Across the Neotropics, phyllostomids seem to have adapted to these constraints by
55
56 adopting a phenology known as *bimodal polyestry*, consisting of the production of two young
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 between the end of the dry season and the middle of the wet season (Wilson 1973; Ribeiro de
5
6 Mello and Fernandez 2000; Willig 1985; but see e.g., Duarte and Talamoni 2010 for exceptions
7
8 to bimodal polyestry). However, plant phenology, and vertebrate and invertebrate prey dynamics
9
10 vary across forest types and locations (Patricia and Morellato 2011; Hällfors et al 2020), with
11
12 some Neotropical biomes displaying seasonal fruiting patterns with fruiting peaks occurring
13
14 during the wet season (Malizia 2001; Alencar et al. 1979; Peres 1994), while others show
15
16 aseasonal (Alencar 1990; Wallace and Painter 2002) or bimodal patterns with both peaks
17
18 occurring during the dry season (ter Steege and Persaud 1991). Notwithstanding the scarcity of
19
20 assemblage-wide phenology studies in Neotropical bats, this variation in resource availability
21
22 seems to greatly influence bat phenology throughout the region (Estrada and Coates-Estrada
23
24 2001; Bernard 2002; Durant et al 2013; de Carvalho et al 2019).
25
26
27
28
29
30

31
32 Here, we address the information gap in tropical bat phenology by describing the reproductive
33
34 phenology of nine Central Amazonian phyllostomid species, as well as two feeding ensembles,
35
36 frugivores and gleaning animalivores. We compare our results to findings from other locations
37
38 across the Neotropics in order to identify and explore the underlying drivers of geographic
39
40 variation in phenology across species' ranges. We anticipated that the reproductive activity of
41
42 most species will be modulated by seasonality, likely reflecting the timing of maximum fruit and
43
44 arthropod availability.
45
46
47
48
49

50 51 **Material and methods**

52 53 54 *Study site and climate*

55
56
57 This study was conducted at the Biological Dynamics of Forest Fragments Project (BDFFP), a
58
59 whole-ecosystem experimental manipulation located ca. 80 km north of Manaus in the Central
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 Brazilian Amazon (2°20'S, 60°6'W, 30–125 m above sea level; Fig. 1). The BDFFP was
5
6 established in the 1980s to assess the effects of forest fragment size on tropical ecosystems
7
8 (Lovejoy and Bierregaard 1990). To do so, forest fragments (1, 10, and 100 ha) were isolated
9
10 from nearby continuous *terra firme* rainforest by distances of 80-650 m. Forest fragments were
11
12 originally located within cattle ranches but became gradually surrounded by secondary forest
13
14 dominated mainly by *Vismia* spp. and *Cecropia* spp. (Carreiras et al. 2014; Rocha et al. 2018).
15
16 Primary forest reaches 30-37 m in mean canopy height, with isolated trees up to 55 m tall
17
18 (Laurance et al. 2011). Rainfall varies from 1,900 to 3,500 mm annually, with a dry season
19
20 between July and November and a rainy season between November and June (Ferreira et al.
21
22 2017). Precipitation can exceed 300 mm/month in the wet season, while being under 100
23
24 mm/month during the dry season (Laurance et al. 2011; Fig. 2). The flowering peak occurs
25
26 during the transition between the wet and the dry season, and the fruiting peak occurs at the
27
28 beginning of the wet season (Haugaasen and Peres 2005; Haugaasen and Peres 2007; Bentos et
29
30 al. 2008).
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 *Bat surveys*

40
41
42 Bats were surveyed between August 2011 and October 2014, using both ground- and canopy-
43
44 level mist nets placed in a variety of habitats: continuous primary forest, forest fragments and
45
46 secondary forest in which standardized surveys were conducted, as well as temporary lakes,
47
48 rivers, streams, and clearings where we sampled opportunistically (Farneda et al. 2015; Silva et
49
50 al. 2020; Rocha et al. 2020; Torrent et al. 2018). Sampling started at dusk and mist nets were
51
52 deployed until 0:00 am, being revised at intervals of ~20 minutes. Captured bats were identified
53
54 to species level using available field guides and morphological keys (López-Baucells et al. 2018)
55
56 and standard morphometric (e.g., forearm length and body mass) and demographic data were
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 collected following Handley et al. (1991). The extent of ossification of the phalanges was used to
5
6 distinguish between adults and juveniles. Pregnant females were identified through gentle
7
8 palpation of the abdomen and lactating females were identified according to the condition of the
9
10 mamma (i.e., milk, evidence of hair loss around the nipples). Since small foetuses may go
11
12 undetected through palpation, the number of nonreproductive adult females may be an
13
14 overestimate. Bat capture and handling was conducted following guidelines approved by the
15
16 American Society of Mammalogists (Sikes and Gannon 2011). Taxonomy follows López-
17
18 Baucells et al. (2018) except for *Mimon crenulatum* which is referred to as *Gardnerycteris*
19
20 *crenulatum* (Hurtado et al. 2014). Detailed site descriptions and sampling methods can be found
21
22 in Rocha et al. (2017b), Silva et al. (2020), Rocha et al. (2020), and Torrent et al. (2018).
23
24
25
26
27
28

29 *Classification of reproductive phenologies*

30
31
32 We classified population- and ensemble-level reproductive phenologies following Durant et al.
33
34 (2013). For adult female bats, we counted the number of pregnancy and lactation peaks. In
35
36 accordance with Durant et al. (2013), we considered two types of peaks: a *primary peak*, defined
37
38 as the period with the higher proportion of pregnant/lactating females, bounded by periods where
39
40 the proportion of pregnant/lactating females was at least twice as low; and *secondary peak(s)*,
41
42 defined in a similar manner but with the difference that the proportion of the secondary peaks
43
44 was at least 50% of the proportion of the primary peak. Depending on the number of peaks along
45
46 the year, we expected to observe four different phenological patterns: *amodal* if there was no
47
48 peak in reproduction/lactation but nonreproductive females were detected throughout the year;
49
50 *unimodal* if there was one peak in reproduction followed by a peak in lactation; *bimodal* if there
51
52 were two peaks in reproduction, each followed by peaks in lactation; and *polymodal* if there were
53
54 more than two peaks in reproduction. Due to the lack of recapture data we were not able to
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 identify if a given individual female was pregnant more than once a year. As such, similarly to
5
6 Durant et al. (2013), we were unable to classify species according to the five traditional
7
8 reproductive phenologies (aseasonal monoestry, aseasonal polyestry, seasonal monoestry,
9
10 seasonal bimodal polyestry and seasonal polyestry; Wilson 1973). Notwithstanding the lack of
11
12 data regarding the number of estrous cycles (monoestrous [single] vs polyestrous [multiple]) for
13
14 our study populations, whenever possible we use available literature from elsewhere to discuss
15
16 the recorded type of estrous cycle of our target species.
17
18
19
20
21

22 According to the seasonal variation of our study area, we defined six periods: June-July, August-
23
24 September and October-November respectively as the early, mid and late dry season, and
25
26 December-January, February-March and April-May respectively as the early, mid and late dry
27
28 seasons. At the species and ensemble level, a species/ensemble was retained in the analysis if at
29
30 least five adult females were captured in a minimum of four periods. At the species level, nine
31
32 species met these requirements, six of which are frugivores and three are gleaning animalivores
33
34 (Table 1). These conditions were also met by two ensembles: frugivores and gleaning
35
36 animalivores. The species included in ensemble level analysis were those listed in Table 1 in
37
38 addition to *Ametrida centurio*, *Artibeus cinereus*, *Artibeus gnomus*, *Mesophylla macconnelli*,
39
40 *Sturnira tildae* and *Vampyressa bidens* for the frugivores, and *Tonatia saurophila* for the
41
42 gleaning animalivores.
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 *Data analysis*

50
51
52 For data analysis, the proportion of pregnant, lactating, and nonreproductive female bats for each
53
54 species/ensemble was calculated as the number of individuals falling into each category, divided
55
56 by the total number of females captured for that species/ensemble. At the ensemble level, the
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 proportion of bats falling in each category was weighted by species-specific bi-monthly
5
6 abundance.

7
8
9
10 We used circular statistics to test the deviation of the number of pregnant and lactating females
11 throughout the year from uniformity at the species and ensemble level. The use of circular
12 statistics to test for temporal differences in the number of pregnant and lactating females is
13
14 justified by the inherent periodicity of pregnancy and lactation data (Landler et al. 2018; Ruxton
15 2017). An improved version of the Hermans-Rasson test presented in Landler et al. (2019) as
16
17 well as the Rayleigh test (Zar, 1999) were performed in order to test for departure from a uniform
18
19 distribution. These tests have similar purposes, but they were both performed because contrary to
20
21 other classical circular tests like the Rayleigh test or the Watson's U test, the Hermans-Rasson
22
23 test is robust to data with a bimodal distribution (Landler et al. 2019). However, the robustness of
24
25 the improved version of the Hermans-Rasson test has not been assessed yet (Landler et al. 2019).
26
27 The Rayleigh test, which is robust to highly grouped data, was therefore also performed
28
29 (Humphreys and Ruxton 2017). Both tests were implemented using the package *circular*
30
31 (Jammalamadaka and Sengupta 2001) and the code provided by Landler et al. (2019). Graphics
32
33 were made with the package *ggplot2* (Wickham 2016) in the software R (Core R Team 2019),
34
35 and rose diagrams were made in the software Oriana (Kovach 2013).
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 **Results**

49
50
51 Nine phyllostomids met the minimum capture numbers established for the phenology analyses
52
53 and classification at the species level. This included six frugivorous bats (*Artibeus concolor*, *A.*
54
55 *obscurus*, *A. lituratus*, *Carollia brevicauda*, *C. perspicillata*, and *Rhinophylla pumilio*) as well as
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 three gleaning animalivores (*Lophostoma silvicolum*, *Gardnerycteris crenulatum*, and *Trachops*
5
6 *cirrhosus*).

7
8
9
10 Notwithstanding some minor discrepancies, the results of the Hermans-Rasson (H-R) and
11
12 Rayleigh (R) tests were largely consistent. For pregnancy, both tests suggested that *A. concolor*,
13
14 *A. lituratus*, *C. brevicauda*, *C. perspicillata*, *R. pumilio*, and the frugivore ensemble exhibited
15
16 non-uniform distributions, meaning that they display at least one peak in pregnancy (Table 1).
17
18 However, non-uniform pregnancy distributions were suggested for *A. obscurus*, *G. crenulatum*,
19
20 *T. cirrhosus*, and gleaning animalivorous bats by the H-R test, but not by the R test. On the other
21
22 hand, *L. silvicolum* was identified as having a uniform distribution based on the H-R test but a
23
24 uniform distribution with the R test. For lactation, both tests suggested that *A. lituratus*, *C.*
25
26 *perspicillata*, *L. silvicolum*, *R. pumilio*, as well as the frugivore and gleaning animalivore
27
28 ensembles exhibited non-uniform distributions, meaning that they display at least one peak in
29
30 lactation (Table 2). However, the results of the H-R and R tests were contradictory for *T.*
31
32 *cirrhosus* (uniform lactation according to H-R but non-uniform according to R) and to *A.*
33
34 *concolor* and *C. brevicauda* (non-uniform lactation according to H-R but uniform according to
35
36 R). Five out of the nine species, namely *A. lituratus*, *A. obscurus*, *C. perspicillata*, *G. crenulatum*,
37
38 and *R. pumilio* exhibited a unimodal pregnancy distribution, and so did the frugivore ensemble,
39
40 even when the more common species *C. perspicillata* was excluded (Fig. 3-5). However,
41
42 pregnancy was bimodal for *A. concolor*, *C. brevicauda*, and *T. cirrhosus*, amodal for gleaning
43
44 animalivorous bats and, according to Durant et al. (2013)'s definition, the pattern for *L.*
45
46 *silvicolum* was polymodal (Table 1, Fig. 3-5). With the exception of *L. silvicolum*, all species and
47
48 feeding ensembles display their primary pregnancy peak during the mid dry season, indicating a
49
50 high degree of interspecific pregnancy synchronization (Fig. 3-5). Likewise, other than *L.*
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 *silvicolum*, all species displaying a secondary pregnancy peak experienced it during the late wet
5
6 season (Table 1).
7
8
9

10
11 As for lactation, *A. obscurus*, *G. crenulatum*, *L. silvicolum*, *R. pumilio*, and the gleaning
12
13 animalivores ensemble exhibited a unimodal distribution, whereas *A. concolor*, *A. lituratus*, *C.*
14
15 *brevicauda*, *C. perspicillata*, *T. cirrhosus*, and the frugivore ensemble displayed a pattern in
16
17 accordance with a bimodal distribution (including when *C. perspicillata* was excluded) (Figure 3,
18
19 Figure 4). However, due to the lack of information for the early wet season, it is unclear whether
20
21 the lactation pattern of *A. concolor*, *A. lituratus*, and *C. perspicillata* was unimodal or bimodal.
22
23 The primary lactation peak occurred during the mid wet season for *A. obscurus* and the frugivore
24
25 ensemble, during the mid dry season for *C. brevicuda* and *L. silvicolum*, during the late dry
26
27 season for *G. crenulatum*, *R. pumilio*, and the gleaning animalivores, and during the early dry
28
29 season for *T. cirrhosus*, indicating a lower degree of interspecific lactation synchronization
30
31 (Table 2). Except for *C. brevicuda*, all species displaying a bimodal lactation phenology had
32
33 their secondary lactation peak during the late dry season.
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 At the ensemble level, frugivores and gleaning animalivores exhibited distinct reproductive
44
45 patterns. In the case of frugivores, pregnancies were concentrated in the mid dry season, while for
46
47 gleaning animalivores, high levels of pregnancy were observed throughout the year, with a peak
48
49 occurring during the mid wet season. Regarding lactation, while a bimodal phenology with a
50
51 primary peak during the mid wet season and a secondary peak during the late dry season was
52
53 observed for frugivorous species, a bimodal pattern with a primary peak during the late dry
54
55 season was observed for gleaning animalivores.
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5 **Discussion**
6

7
8
9 Despite the importance of studies on reproductive phenology to better understand the energetic
10 requirements of species over time, assessments using rigorous classification approaches for
11 tropical bat species are scarce. Here, we described the phenology of nine of the most common
12 Amazonian phyllostomids, providing the first consistent analysis of reproductive phenology for
13 four out of nine species studied. Our results indicate that most species exhibit a high degree of
14 synchronization of their pregnancy and lactation peaks. This adds to an expanding body of
15 evidence suggesting that the reproductive phenology of Neotropical bats is largely modulated by
16 seasonality and its associated shifts in resource availability (Hernández-Aguilar and Santos-
17 Moreno 2020; Lima and Fabián 2016).
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 Although over 160 bat species occur throughout the Amazon (López-Baucells et al. 2018), very
32 little is known about the reproductive phenology of most of these species. Indeed, with the
33 exception of a few isolated observations of pregnant or lactating individuals of *Artibeus concolor*
34 (Bernard 2002), *A. obscurus* (Bernard 2002; Albuja 1999), *Gardnerycteris crenulatum* (Pedro et
35 al. 1994; Mello and Pol 2006), and *Rhinophylla pumilio* (Rinehart and Kunz 2006; Bernard 2002;
36 Rocha et al. 2017a), no comprehensive study has been conducted to specifically assess the
37 reproductive phenology of these species.
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 In the Neotropics, a common pattern is that frugivorous phyllostomids generally experience a
50 reproductive peak during the late dry season and a second peak during the mid wet season
51 (Fleming et al. 1972; Molinari and Soriano 2014; Durant et al. 2013). In some species, this trend
52 is often facilitated by the ability of bats to delay the development of the embryo and produce milk
53 while pregnant, a phenomenon known as postpartum oestrus, enabling them to give birth twice a
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 year (Ortega et al. 2021). Yet, while all but one of the focal species showed a primary pregnancy
5
6 peak during the mid dry season, only two of the six species considered - *A. concolor* and *Carollia*
7
8 *brevicauda* - exhibited gestation patterns characteristic of bimodal phenology. *Carollia*
9
10 *brevicauda* was observed to be bimodally polyestrous in the Venezuelan Andes (Molinari and
11
12 Soriano 2014) and Costa Rica (La Val and Fitch 1977). However, Torres et al. (2018) found that
13
14 *C. brevicauda* reproduces throughout the year with very low synchrony in Colombia.
15
16
17 Additionally, at the BDFFP, *A. lituratus*, *A. obscurus*, and *C. perspicillata* evinced a unimodal
18
19 gestation phenology, suggesting some divergence from previous findings. The reported number
20
21 of reproductive peaks varies geographically for these species and, corroborating our results,
22
23 Duarte and Talamoni (2010) reported *A. lituratus* as a seasonally monoestrous species in Brazil.
24
25 Yet, Fleming et al. (1972) and Willig (1985) described it as being polyestrous, with birth periods
26
27 occurring during the mid dry season and during the mid wet season. Furthermore, Tamsitt and
28
29 Valdivieso (1963) reported *A. lituratus* as aseasonally polyestrous. On the other hand, while in
30
31 accordance with our findings *C. perspicillata* was described as having a unimodal reproductive
32
33 phenology in Costa Rica (Stoner 2001), it has often been observed to have a bimodal
34
35 reproduction pattern elsewhere (Mello et al. 2004; Ribeiro de Mello and Fernandez 2000;
36
37 Charles-Dominique 1991; Ramirez-Pulido et al. 1993, La Val & Fitch 1977; Heithaus et al. 1975;
38
39 Fleming et al. 1972). For *A. lituratus*, *A. obscurus*, and *C. perspicillata*, the presence of a high
40
41 proportion of lactating females during the mid wet season is consistent with a secondary
42
43 pregnancy peak during the early wet season for which we lack capture data. Therefore, it cannot
44
45 be excluded that even at the BDFFP these species may be seasonally polyestrous with a bimodal
46
47 reproductive phenology. This hypothesis is further supported by the ability of *C. perspicillata*
48
49 and *A. lituratus* to perform postpartum oestrus (Rasweiler and Badwaik 1997; Rodrigues et al.
50
51 2006). As suggested by Molinari and Soriano (2014), another hypothesis as to why these species
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 experience geographic variation in their reproductive phenology is that the fruiting season is too
5
6 short at our study site to allow species such as *C. perspicillata* to produce two offspring in this
7
8 timeframe.
9

10
11 Compared with frugivores, the reproductive phenology of insectivorous phyllostomids is
12
13 particularly poorly known. Durant et al. (2013), Dechmann (2005), and Estrada and Coastes-
14
15 Estrada (2001) reported results ranging from seasonal monoestry and aseasonal monoestry to
16
17 seasonal bimodal polyestry for different species. As in our study, *Trachops cirrhosus* was
18
19 described as bimodally polyestrous by Sánchez-Hernández and Romero-Almaraz (1995) in
20
21 Mexico. The reproductive phenology we observed in *Lophostoma silvicolum* at the BDFFP
22
23 differs from observations made on all other species in our study, and its multimodal gestation
24
25 does not match its unimodal lactation pattern. On Barro Colorado Island (Panama), *L. silvicolum*
26
27 was observed to have two pregnancy peaks - one during the late dry season and another during
28
29 the mid dry season - and the species was suggested as being capable of postpartum estrus
30
31 (Dechmann et al. 2005). Pregnant females may therefore be able to give birth when resources are
32
33 at their maximum, e.g., during the mid dry season, explaining the presence of a single lactation
34
35 peak for this species.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43
44 At the ensemble level, pregnancy of the frugivores was unimodal, and lactation was bimodal with
45
46 peaks occurring during the late dry and mid wet seasons. However, as with *A. lituratus*, *A.*
47
48 *concolor*, *C. brevicauda*, and *C. perspicillata*, the high proportion of lactating females captured
49
50 in the late dry and mid wet season suggests that the frugivorous ensemble may have a bimodal
51
52 reproductive phenology with a primary pregnancy peak occurring during the early wet season.
53
54 This idea is supported by the fruiting peak in the early wet season at our study site (Haugaasen
55
56 and Peres 2005, 2007; Bentos et al. 2008). Compared with frugivores, the gleaning animalivores
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 displayed a more constant pregnancy phenology, with a high proportion of pregnant bats
5
6 observed throughout the year, and lactation mostly concentrated during the dry period. In Costa
7
8 Rica, this ensemble exhibited a single reproduction peak in the mid-late dry season (Durant et al.
9
10 2013), but the authors documented geographical variation in the reproductive strategy of gleaning
11
12 animalivores: unimodal phenology was observed for this ensemble in Costa Rica while bimodal
13
14 phenology was reported in northern South America and Mesoamerica (Durant et al. 2013). This
15
16 difference in reproductive strategy may be due to smaller fluctuations in the availability of
17
18 feeding resources for gleaning animalivores than for frugivores. Nonetheless our findings suggest
19
20 that reproduction appears to be timed so that resources are abundant both when females are
21
22 lactating and when pups are weaned, therefore maximizing the success of reproduction in both
23
24 ensembles.
25
26
27
28
29

30
31
32 The ensemble-level phenology often does not correspond to the phenology of its component
33
34 species. Mismatches of the reproductive phenology between specific species and their feeding
35
36 ensemble are likely due to species-specific differences in preferred food resources and their
37
38 temporal availability, or due to dietary flexibility associated with the capacity of complementing
39
40 the diet with items typically associated with a different ensemble - e.g., consumption of insects
41
42 by frugivorous bats or fruits for gleaning animalivores, therefore allowing species to exhibit more
43
44 than one reproductive peak during a given season (Durant et al. 2013). In accordance, Estrada
45
46 and Coates-Estrada (2001) reported that some frugivorous bat species with similar feeding habits
47
48 may exhibit different reproductive phenologies due to differences in their preference for specific
49
50 plant taxa (Dinerstein 1986), and by the differences in the fruiting phenology of these species
51
52 (Laska 1990; Fleming et al. 1972). For instance, the timing of reproduction of *Cynopterus*
53
54 *brachyotis* is strongly correlated with the timing of mango fruiting (Kofron 1997). Ecologically
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 similar species that occur in sympatry may therefore exhibit different reproductive phenologies
5
6 despite similar fruiting conditions (Stevenson et al., 2000).
7
8

9
10 Until now, few studies have illustrated the reproductive phenology of Neotropical bats. Species-
11
12 level characterization of the pregnancy and lactation patterns are challenging due to considerable
13
14 geographic biotic (timing and duration of resource availability) and abiotic (timing and duration
15
16 of the rainy season) variation. However, such studies remain essential to better understand the
17
18 biology of bats and the factors influencing their reproductive phenology. Fragmentation can
19
20 affect the reproduction of some Neotropical bat species, often in a species-specific manner (de
21
22 Oliveira et al. 2017) and leading to sex-specific responses to landscape features (Rocha et al.
23
24 2017a). Thus, it cannot be excluded that the phenology patterns observed at our study area are not
25
26 influenced by fragmentation. Indeed, at a time when anthropogenic stressors such as
27
28 fragmentation and global warming are increasingly influencing the reproductive behaviour of a
29
30 wide array of taxa (Klapwijk and Lewis 2008; Grazer and Martin 2012; Rocha et al. 2017a; Rossi
31
32 et al. 2019) understanding which parameters modulate bat reproductive patterns can provide key
33
34 conservation insights. Further long-term studies are paramount to investigate the reproductive
35
36 behaviour of bats, particularly across the tropics, where the reproductive phenology of most
37
38 species remains unknown.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 **References**

49

50
51
52
53 Albuja L (1999) Murciélagos del Ecuador. Second edition. Cicetrónica Compañía Limitada Offset,
54
55 Quito, Ecuador.
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 Alencar J. da C (1990) Interpretação fenológica de espécies lenhosas de Campina na Reserva
5
6 Biológica de Campina do INPA ao Norte de Manaus. *Acta Amazon* 20:145–183.
7
8
9 <https://doi.org/10.1590/1809-43921990201183>

10
11
12 Alencar J da C, Raimundo A de A, Noeli PF (1979) Fenologia de espécies florestais em floresta
13
14 tropical úmida de terra firme na Amazônia Central. *Acta Amazon* 9:163–99.
15
16
17 <https://doi.org/10.1590/1809-43921979091163>.

18
19
20 Arlettaz R, Christe P, Lugon A, Perrin N, Vogel P (2001) Food availability dictates the timing of
21
22 parturition in insectivorous mouse-eared bats. *Oikos* 95:105–11.
23
24
25 <https://doi.org/10.1034/j.1600-0706.2001.950112.x>.

26
27
28 Bentos TV, Mesquita RCG, Williamson BG (2008) Reproductive Phenology of Central Amazon
29
30 Pioneer Trees. *Trop Conserv Sci* 1:186–203.
31
32
33 <https://doi.org/10.1177/194008290800100303>.

34
35
36
37 Bernard E (2002) Diet, activity and reproduction of bat species (Mammalia, Chiroptera) in
38
39 Central Amazonia, Brazil. *Rev Bras Zool* 19:173–88. [https://doi.org/10.1590/s0101-](https://doi.org/10.1590/s0101-81752002000100016)
40
41 [81752002000100016](https://doi.org/10.1590/s0101-81752002000100016).

42
43
44
45 Bronson FH (1985) *Mammalian reproduction: An ecological perspective*. Oxford Academic.
46
47
48 <https://doi.org/10.1095/biolreprod32.1.1>.

49
50
51 Carreiras JMB, Jones J, Lucas RM, Gabriel (2014) Land use and land cover change dynamics
52
53 across the Brazilian Amazon: Insights from extensive time- series analysis of remote
54
55 sensing data. *PLoS One* 9, e104144. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0104144>
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 de Carvalho WD, Martins MA, Dias D, Saldaña-Vázquez RA, Palmeirim JM, Esbérard CEL
5
6 (2019) Reproductive constraints in frugivorous phyllostomid bats: Seasonal and
7
8 elevational variation in reproductive rates in the Brazilian Atlantic Forest. *J Mammal*
9
10 100:487–499. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jmammal/gyz031>
11
12
13

14 Charles-Dominique P (1991) Feeding strategy and activity budget of the frugivorous bat *Carollia*
15
16 *perspicillata* (Chiroptera: Phyllostomidae) in French Guiana. *J Trop Ecol* 7:243–256.
17
18 <https://doi.org/10.1017/S026646740000540X>.
19
20
21

22 Core R Team (2019) A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing. [http://www.r-](http://www.r-project.org)
23
24 [project.org](http://www.r-project.org).
25
26
27

28 Dechmann DKN, Kalko EKV, König B, Kerth G (2005) Mating system of a neotropical roost-
29
30 making bat: The white-throated, round-eared bat, *Lophostoma silvicolum* (Chiroptera:
31
32 Phyllostomidae). *Behav Ecol Sociobiol* 58:316–325. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s00265-005-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00265-005-0913-y)
33
34 [0913-y](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00265-005-0913-y).
35
36
37

38 Dinerstein E (1986) Reproductive ecology of fruit bats and the seasonality of fruit production in a
39
40 Costa Rican cloud forest. *Biotropica* 18:307–318. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2388574>.
41
42
43

44 Duarte APG, Talamoni SA (2010) Reproduction of the large fruit-eating bat *Artibeus lituratus*
45
46 (Chiroptera: Phyllostomidae) in a Brazilian Atlantic forest area. *Mamm Biol* 75:320–325.
47
48 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mambio.2009.04.004>.
49
50
51

52 Durant KA, Hall RW, Cisneros LM, Hyland RM, Willig MR (2013) Reproductive phenologies of
53
54 phyllostomid bats in Costa Rica. *J Mammal* 94:1438–1448. [https://doi.org/10.1644/13-](https://doi.org/10.1644/13-MAMM-A-103.1)
55
56 [MAMM-A-103.1](https://doi.org/10.1644/13-MAMM-A-103.1).
57
58
59

1
2
3
4 Estrada A, Coates-Estrada R (2001) Species composition and reproductive phenology of bats in a
5
6 tropical landscape at Los Tuxtlas, Mexico. *J Trop Ecol* 17:627–646.

7
8
9 <https://doi.org/10.1017/S026646740100147X>.

10
11
12 Farneda FZ, Rocha R, López- Baucells A, Groenenberg M, Silva I, Palmeirim JM, Bobrowiec
13
14 PE, Meyer CF (2015) Trait- related responses to habitat fragmentation in Amazonian
15
16 bats. *J Appl Ecol* 52:1381-1391. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2664.12490>.

17
18
19
20 Ferreira DF, Rocha R, López-Baucells A, Farneda FZ, Carreiras JMB, Palmeirim JM, Meyer CFJ
21
22 (2017) Season-modulated responses of Neotropical bats to forest fragmentation. *Ecol*
23
24
25
26
27 *Evol* 7:4059–4071. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ece3.3005>.

28
29 Fleming TH, Hooper ET, Wilson DE (1972) Three Central American bat communities: structure,
30
31 reproductive cycles, and movement patterns. *Ecology* 53:555–569.
32
33
34
35
36 <https://doi.org/10.2307/1934771>.

37 Fleming TH, Dávalos LM, Mello MA (ed) (2020) *Phyllostomid Bats: A Unique Mammalian*
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
Radiation. University of Chicago Press.

66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

51 Hällfors MH, Antão LH, Itter M, Lehikoinen A, Lindholm T, Roslin T, Saastamoinen M (2020)
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

1
2
3
4 Handley CO, Wilson DE, Gardner AL (1991) Demography and natural history of the common
5
6 fruit bat, *Artibeus jamaicensis*, on Barro Colorado Island, Panamá. *Smithson Contrib Zool*
7
8 511. <https://doi.org/10.5479/si.00810282.511>.
9

10
11
12 Harshman LG, Zera AJ (2007) The cost of reproduction: the devil in the details. *Trends Ecol*
13
14 *Evol* 22:80–86. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2006.10.008>
15
16

17
18 Haugaasen T, Peres CA (2005) Tree phenology in adjacent Amazonian flooded and unflooded
19
20 forests. *Biotropica* 37:620–630. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-7429.2005.00079.x>.
21
22

23
24 Haugaasen T, Peres CA (2007) Vertebrate responses to fruit production in Amazonian flooded
25
26 and unflooded forests. *Biodivers Conserv* 16:4165–4190. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s10531-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10531-007-9217-z)
27
28 [007-9217-z](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10531-007-9217-z).
29
30

31
32 Heithaus ER, Fleming TH, Opler PA (1975) Foraging patterns and resource utilization in seven
33
34 species of bats in a seasonal tropical forest. *Ecology* 56:841–854.
35
36
37 <https://doi.org/10.2307/1936295>
38
39

40
41 Hernández-Aguilar I, Santos-Moreno A (2020) Reproduction and population dynamics of cave-
42
43 dwelling bats in Costa of Oaxaca, México. *Rev Bio Trop* 68:785-802.
44
45
46 <https://dx.doi.org/10.15517/rbt.v68i3.41590>
47

48
49 Humphreys RK, Ruxton GD (2017) Consequences of grouped data for testing for departure from
50
51 circular uniformity. *Behav Ecol Sociobiol* 71:1–7. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s00265-017-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00265-017-2393-2)
52
53 [2393-2](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00265-017-2393-2)
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1
2
3
4 Hurtado N, Pacheco V, Hurtado-Miranda NE, Pacheco-Torres V (2014) Análisis filogenético del
5
6 género Mimon Gray, 1847 (Mammalia, Chiroptera, Phyllostomidae) con la descripción de
7
8 un nuevo género. *Therya* 5:751–791. [https://doi: 10.12933/therya-14-230](https://doi.org/10.12933/therya-14-230)
9
10
11
12 Jammalamadaka SR, Sengupta A (2001) Topics in Circular Statistics, Volume 5.
13
14
15
16 Klapwijk M, Lewis O (2008) Effects of Climate change and Habitat Fragmentation on Trophic
17
18 Interactions. UNESCO Eolss Publishers
19
20
21 Kofron CP (1997) Reproduction of two species of congeneric fruit bats (*Cynopterus*) in Brunei,
22
23 Borneo. *J Zool* 243:485–506. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-7998.1997.tb02796.x>.
24
25
26
27 Kovach WL (2013) Oriana for Windows. In Kovach Computing Services. Accessed 23
28
29 November 2021
30
31
32
33 Kunz TH, Whitaker JO, Wadanoli MD (1995) Dietary energetics of the insectivorous Mexican
34
35 free-tailed bat (*Tadarida brasiliensis*) during pregnancy and lactation. *Oecologia*
36
37 101:407–415. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00329419>.
38
39
40
41 Kurta A, Bell GP, Nagy KA, Kunz TH (1989) Energetics of pregnancy and lactation in free-
42
43 ranging little brown bats (*Myotis lucifugus*). *Physiol Zool* 62:804–818.
44
45
46 <https://doi.org/10.1086/physzool.62.3.30157928>.
47
48
49 La Val RK, Fitch HS (1977) Structure, movements and reproduction in three Costa Rican bat
50
51 communities. *Occas Pap Mus Nat Hist* 69:1–27. <https://doi.org/10.5962/bhl.part.24794>.
52
53
54
55 Landler L, Ruxton GD, Malkemper EP (2018) Circular data in biology: advice for effectively
56
57 implementing statistical procedures. *Behav Ecol Sociobiol* 72:1–10.
58
59
60 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00265-018-2538-y>.
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 Landler L, Ruxton GD, Malkemper EP (2019) The Hermans-Rasson test as a powerful alternative
5
6 to the Rayleigh test for circular statistics in biology. *BMC Ecol* 19:30.

7
8
9 <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12898-019-0246-8>.

10
11
12 Laska M (1990) Gestation period and between-birth intervals in *Carollia perspicillata*

13
14 (Phyllostomatidae, Chiroptera). *J Zool* 222:697–702. [https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-7998.1990.tb06027.x)
15
16
17 [7998.1990.tb06027.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-7998.1990.tb06027.x).

18
19
20 Laurance WF, Camargo JLC, Luizão RCC, Laurance SG, Pimm SL, Bruna EM, Stouffer PC et al

21
22 (2011) The fate of Amazonian forest fragments: A 32-year investigation. *Biol Conserv*
23
24 144:56-67. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2010.09.021>.

25
26
27 Lima CS, Fabián ME (2016) Reproductive biology of *Artibeus fimbriatus* Gray 1838 (Chiroptera)

28
29 at the southern limit of its geographic range. *Biota Neotrop* 16:e20160231.

30
31
32 <https://doi.org/10.1590/1676-0611-BN-2016-0231>.

33
34
35 López-Baucells A, Rocha R, Bobrowiec PED, Bernard E, Palmeirim JM, Meyer CFJ (2018)

36
37 Field Guide to the Bats of the Amazon. Pelagic Publishing, London.

38
39
40 Lovejoy TE, Bierregaard RO Jr (1990) Central Amazonian forests and the minimum critical size

41
42 of ecosystems project. In Gentry A (Ed.) *Four Neotropical Rainforests*, Yale Univ. Press,
43
44 pp 60-74.

45
46
47 MacArthur RH (1984) *Geographical ecology: Patterns in the distribution of species*. Princeton,

48
49
50 NJ: Princeton University Press.

51
52
53 Malizia LR (2001) Seasonal fluctuations of birds, fruits, and flowers in a subtropical forest of

54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65 *Argentina. Condor* 103:45–61. <https://doi.org/10.1093/condor/103.1.45>

1
2
3
4 McNab BK (1982) Evolutionary alternatives in the physiological ecology of bats. In: Kunz T.H.
5
6 (eds) Ecology of Bats. Springer, Boston, MA.
7
8
9

10 Mello M, Pol A (2006) First record of the bat *Mimon crenulatum* (E. Geoffroy, 1801)
11
12 (Mammalia: Chiroptera) in the state of Rio de Janeiro, Southeastern Brazil. Braz J Biol
13
14 66:295–299.
15
16
17

18 Mello MAR, Schittini GM, Selig P, Bergallo HG (2004) A test of the effects of climate and
19
20 fruiting of Piper species (Piperaceae) on reproductive patterns of the bat *Carollia*
21
22 *perspicillata* (Phyllostomidae). Acta Chiropterol 6:309–318.
23
24
25 <https://doi.org/10.3161/001.006.0209>.
26
27

28 Mello MAR, Fernandez FAS (2000) Reproductive ecology of the bat *Carollia perspicillata*
29
30 (Chiroptera: Phyllostomidae) in a fragment of the Brazilian Atlantic coastal forest. Z
31
32 Saugetierkd 65:340–349.
33
34
35

36 Molinari J, Soriano PJ (2014) Breeding and age-structure seasonality in *Carollia brevicauda*
37
38 and other frugivorous bats (Phyllostomidae) in cloud forests in the Venezuelan Andes.
39
40 Therya 5:81–109. <https://doi.org/10.12933/therya-14-179>.
41
42
43

44 Nurul-Ain E, Rosli H, Kingston T (2017) Resource availability and roosting ecology shape
45
46 reproductive phenology of rain forest insectivorous bats. Biotropica 49:382–94.
47
48
49 <https://doi.org/10.1111/btp.12430>.
50
51
52

53 de Oliveira H F M, de Camargo N F, Gager Y, Aguiar L M S (2017) The Response of Bats
54
55 (Mammalia: Chiroptera) to Habitat Modification in a Neotropical Savannah. Trop
56
57 Conserv Sci 10. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1940082917697263>
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 Ortega J, Gutiérrez EG, Moreno-Santillán DD et al. (2021) Seasonal reproductive synchrony in
5
6 colonies of the Jamaican fruit-eating bat (*Artibeus jamaicensis*) in southeast Mexico.

7
8
9 Mamm Res 66:627–634. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13364-021-00582-7>

10
11
12 Patricia L, Morellato C (2011) Phenology: An Integrative Environmental Science. South
13
14 America. In MD Schwartz, Springer Science & Business Media, pp 75-92

15
16
17
18 Pedro WA, Komeno CAK, Taddei VA (1994) Morphometrics and biological notes on *Mimon*
19
20 *crenulatum* (Chiroptera: Phyllostomidae). Sér Zool 10:107-112.

21
22
23
24 Peres CA (1994) Composition, density, and fruiting phenology of arborescent palms in an
25
26 Amazonian *terra firme* forest. Biotropica 26:285-294. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2388849>

27
28
29
30 Racey PA, Entwistle AC (2000) Life-history and Reproductive Strategies of Bats. In Crichton
31
32 EG, Krutzsch PH (ed) Reproductive Biology of Bats, Academic Press, pp 363–414.

33
34
35 <https://doi.org/10.1016/b978-012195670-7/50010-2>.

36
37
38 Racey P, Speakman J (1987) The energy costs of pregnancy and lactation in heterothermic bats.
39
40 Symp Zool Soc Lond 57:107–125.

41
42
43
44 Ramirez-Pulido J, Armella MA, Castro-Campillo A (1993) Reproductive patterns of three
45
46 neotropical bats (Chiroptera: Phyllostomidae) in Guerrero, Mexico. Southwest Nat 38:24-

47
48
49 29. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3671640>.

50
51
52 Ramos Pereira MJ, Marques JT, Palmeirim JM (2010) Ecological responses of frugivorous bats
53
54 to seasonal fluctuation in fruit availability in amazonian forests. Biotropica 42:680–687.

55
56
57 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-7429.2010.00635.x>.

1
2
3
4 Ransome RD (1989) Population changes of Greater horseshoe bats studied near Bristol over the
5
6 past twenty- six years. Biol J Linn Soc 38:71–82. [https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1095-
7
8
9 8312.1989.tb01564.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1095-8312.1989.tb01564.x)

10
11
12 Rasweiler JJ, Badwaik NK (1997). Delayed development in the short-tailed fruit bat, *Carollia*
13
14 *perspicillata*. Reproduction 109:7–20. <https://doi:10.1530/jrf.0.1090007>

15
16
17
18 Rinehart BJ, Kunz TH (2006) *Rhinophylla pumilio*. Mamm. Species 791:1–5.
19
20 <https://doi.org/10.1644/791.1>
21
22

23
24 Rocha R, Ferreira DF, López- Baucells A, Farneda FZ, Carreiras JM, Palmeirim JM, Meyer CF
25
26 (2017a) Does sex matter? Gender- specific responses to forest fragmentation in
27
28 Neotropical bats. Biotropica 49:881-890. <https://doi.org/10.1111/btp.12474>
29
30

31
32 Rocha R, López-Baucells A, Farneda FZ, Groenenberg M, Bobrowiec PE, Cabeza M, Palmeirim
33
34 JM, Meyer CF (2017b) Consequences of a large-scale fragmentation experiment for
35
36 Neotropical bats: disentangling the relative importance of local and landscape-scale
37
38 effects. Landscape Ecol 32:31-45. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10980-016-0425-3>
39
40

41
42 Rocha R, Ovaskainen O, López-Baucells A, Farneda FZ, Sampaio EM, Bobrowiec PED, Cabeza
43
44 M, Palmeirim JM, Meyer CFJ (2018) Secondary forest regeneration benefits old-growth
45
46 specialist bats in a fragmented tropical landscape. Sci Rep 8: 3819.
47
48 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-018-21999-2>
49
50

51
52
53 Rocha R, López-Baucells A, Farneda FZ, Ferreira DF, Silva I, Acácio M, Palmeirim JM, Meyer
54
55 CF (2020) Second-growth and small forest clearings have little effect on the temporal
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 activity patterns of Amazonian phyllostomid bats. *Curr Zool* 66:145-153.

5
6
7 <https://doi.org/10.1093/cz/zoz042>
8
9

10 Rodrigues AF, Santiago CS, Morielle-Versute E, Taboga SR, Beguelini MR (2019)

11 Morphological variation of the female reproductive organs of the bat *Artibeus lituratus*

12 during its different reproductive phases. *J Morphol* 280:1141– 1155.

13
14
15
16
17 <https://doi.org/10.1002/jmor.21006>
18
19

20 Rossi S, Gravili C, Milisenda G, Bosch-Belmar M, De Vito D, Piraino S (2019) Effects of global

21 warming on reproduction and potential dispersal of Mediterranean Cnidarians. *Eur Zool J*

22
23
24
25
26
27 86:255–271. <https://doi.org/10.1080/24750263.2019.1631893>
28

29 Ruxton GD (2017) Testing for departure from uniformity and estimating mean direction for

30 circular data. *Biol Lett* 13:2016075. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsbl.2016.0756>.

31
32
33
34 Sánchez-Hernández C (1995) Murciélagos de Tabasco y Campeche una propuesta para su

35 conservacion. *Cuadernos del Instituto de Biología* 24.
36
37
38
39

40 Sikes RS, Gannon WL (2011) Guidelines of the American Society of Mammalogists for the use

41 of wild mammals in research. *J Mammal* 92:235-253

42
43
44
45
46
47 <https://doi.org/10.1093/jmammal/gyw078>
48

49 Silva I, Rocha R, López-Baucells A, Farneda FZ, Meyer CF (2020) Effects of forest

50 fragmentation on the vertical stratification of neotropical bats. *Diversity* 12:67.

51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65 <https://doi.org/10.3390/d12020067>

1
2
3
4 da Silva NAP, Frizzas MR, de Oliveira CM (2011) Seasonality in insect abundance in the
5
6 “Cerrado” of Goiás State, Brazil. *Rev Bras Entomol* 55:79–87.
7
8
9 <https://doi.org/10.1590/S0085-56262011000100013>

10
11
12 Speakman JR, Thomas DW (2003) Physiological ecology and energetic of bats. In Kunz TH,
13
14 Fenton BM (eds) *Bat Ecology*, Chicago, Illinois: The University of Chicago Press, pp
15
16 430–92.
17
18

19
20 Steege H. ter, Persaud CA (1991) The phenology of Guyanese timber species: a compilation of a
21
22 century of observations. *Vegetatio* 95:177–198. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00045216>
23
24

25
26 Stevenson PR, Quiñones MJ, Ahumada JA (2000) Influence of fruit availability on ecological
27
28 overlap among four neotropical primates at Tinigua National Park, Colombia. *Biotropica*
29
30 32:533–544. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-7429.2000.tb00499.x>
31
32

33
34 Stoner KE (2001) Differential habitat use and reproductive patterns of frugivorous bats in tropical
35
36 dry forest of northwestern Costa Rica. *Can J Zool* 79:1626–1633.
37
38
39 <https://doi.org/10.1139/cjz-79-9-1626>.
40
41

42
43 Stucky, BJ, Guralnick R, Deck J, Denny EG, Bolmgren K, Walls R (2018) The plant phenology
44
45 ontology: A new informatics resource for large-scale integration of plant phenology data.
46
47 *Front Plant Sci* 9:517 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2018.00517>
48
49

50
51 Tamsitt JR, Valdivieso D (1963) Reproductive cycle of the big fruit-eating bat, *Artibeus lituratus*
52
53 Olfers. *Nature* 198:104. <https://doi.org/10.1038/198104a0>.
54
55

56
57 Thomas SP (1975) Metabolism during flight in two species of bats, *Phyllostomous hastatus* and
58
59 *Pteropus gouldii*. *J Exp Biol* 63:273-293.
60
61

- 1
2
3
4 Thompson SD (1992) Gestation and lactation in small mammals: basal metabolic rate and the
5
6 limits of energy use. In Thomasi TF, Horton TH (eds) Mammalian Energetics:
7
8 Interdisciplinary Views of Metabolism and Reproduction, Cornell University Press, New
9
10 York, pp 213–59
11
12
13
14
15 Torrent L, López- Baucells A, Rocha R, Bobrowiec PE, Meyer CF (2018) The importance of
16
17 lakes for bat conservation in Amazonian rainforests: an assessment using autonomous
18
19 recorders. *Remote Sens Ecol Conserv* 4:339-3351. <https://doi.org/10.1002/rse2.83>
20
21
22
23 Torres FR, Madi-Ravazzi L (2006) Seasonal variation in natural populations of *Drosophila* spp.
24
25 (Diptera) in two woodlands in the State of São Paulo, Brazil. *Sér Zool* 96:437–444.
26
27 <https://doi.org/10.1590/S0073-47212006000400008>
28
29
30
31 Torres DA, Henao-Isaza JR, Castaño JH (2018) Reproductive Pattern of the Silky Short-Tailed
32
33 Bat *Carollia brevicauda* (Chiroptera: Phyllostomidae) in the Andes of Colombia. *Mamm*
34
35 *Study* 43:133-139. <https://doi.org/10.3106/ms2017-0082>.
36
37
38
39 Wallace RB, Painter RL (2002) Phenological patterns in a southern Amazonian tropical forest:
40
41 Implications for sustainable management. *Forest Ecol Manag* 160:19–33.
42
43 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-1127\(00\)00723-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-1127(00)00723-4)
44
45
46
47 Wickham H (2016) ggplot2: Elegant graphics for data analysis (2nd ed.). New York, NY:
48
49 Springer.
50
51
52
53 Willig MR (1985) Reproductive patterns of bats from Caatingas and Cerrado Biomes in
54
55 Northeast Brazil. *J Mammal* 66:668–681. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1380793>.
56
57
58
59 Wilson DE (1973) Reproduction in Neotropical bats. *Period Biol* 75:215-217
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Yoh N, Syme P, Rocha R, Meyer CF, López-Baucells A (2020) Echolocation of Central Amazonian ‘whispering’ phyllostomid bats: call design and interspecific variation. *Mammal Res* 65:583-597. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13364-020-00503-0>

Zar JH (1999) *Biostatistical Analysis*. 4th ed. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc.

Table 1 - Summary of tests for departure from uniformity based on the Hermans-Rasson and Rayleigh test, respectively, for pregnant adult female bats. Ensemble abbreviations: F - Frugivorous bats; GA - Gleaning animalivorous bats. The season in which the primary and secondary peaks occur was indicated only when it was relevant to the amodal, unimodal or bimodal character of the reproductive phenology, and indicated by "-" if it was not relevant.

Species	Ensemble	Hermans-Rasson test				Rayleigh's test			Graphical analysis		
		Captures	T	p	Distribution	z	p	Distribution	Phenology	Primary peak	Secondary peak
<i>Artibeus concolor</i>	F	24	717.66	>0.001	Non uniform	0.592	>0.001	Non-uniform	Bimodal	Mid/late dry	Late wet
<i>Artibeus lituratus</i>	F	8	27.31	>0.001	Non uniform	1	0	Non-uniform	Unimodal	Mid dry	-
<i>Artibeus obscurus</i>	F	15	966.59	>0.001	Non uniform	0.359	0.145	Uniform	Unimodal	Mid dry	-
<i>Carollia brevicauda</i>	F	9	229.90	>0.001	Non uniform	0.982	0	Non-uniform	Bimodal	Mid dry	Late wet
<i>Carollia perspicillata</i>	F	315	17,835.71	>0.001	Non uniform	0.622	0	Non-uniform	Unimodal	Mid dry	-
<i>Gardnerycteris crenulatum</i>	GA	8	452.77	0.032	Non uniform	0.269	0.577	Uniform	Unimodal	Mid wet	-
<i>Lophostoma silvicolum</i>	GA	15	1,561.21	0.075	Uniform	0.508	0.018	Non-uniform	Polymodal	Mid dry	Late dry
<i>Rhinophylla pumilio</i>	F	62	3,432.89	>0.001	Non uniform	0.326	0.001	Non-uniform	Unimodal	Mid dry	-
<i>Trachops cirrhosus</i>	GA	14	1,280.02	0.004	Non uniform	0.339	0.203	Uniform	Bimodal	Mid dry	Late wet
	Frugivores	450	27,172.47	>0.001	Non uniform	0.550	0	Non-uniform	Unimodal	Mid dry	-
	Gleaning animalivores	23	4,455.97	>0.001	Non uniform	0.171	0.240	Uniform	Amodal	-	-

Table 2 - Summary of the different analyses for the lactating adult female bats. Ensemble abbreviations: F - Frugivorous bats; GA - Gleaning animalivorous bats. For the graphical analysis, unclear patterns were marked as ‘?’. Calculations were not performed when sample sizes were <5 (indicated as “-”). The season in which the primary and secondary peaks occur was indicated only when it was relevant to the amodal, unimodal or bimodal character of the reproductive phenology, and indicated by "-" if it was not relevant.

Species	Ensemble	Hermans-Rasson test				Rayleigh's test			Graphical analysis		
		Captures	T	p	Distribution	z	p	Distribution	Phenology	Primary peak	Secondary peak
<i>Artibeus concolor</i>	F	8	545.34	0.006	Non uniform	0.184	0.775	Uniform	Uni- or bimodal	?	?
<i>Artibeus lituratus</i>	F	22	1,287.69	>0.001	Non uniform	0.403	0.026	Non uniform	Uni- or bimodal	?	?
<i>Artibeus obscurus</i>	F	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	Unimodal	Mid wet	-
<i>Carollia brevicauda</i>	F	11	1,193.76	0.037	Non uniform	0.180	0.710	Uniform	Bimodal	Mid dry	Mid wet
<i>Carollia perspicillata</i>	F	172	18,081.98	>0.001	Non uniform	0.166	0.009	Non uniform	Uni- or bimodal	?	?
<i>Gardnerycteris crenulatum</i>	GA	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	Unimodal	Late dry	-
<i>Lophostoma silvicolum</i>	GA	9	195.10	>0.001	Non uniform	0.570	0.049	Non uniform	Unimodal	Mid dry	-
<i>Rhinophylla pumilio</i>	F	35	3,114.86	>0.001	Non uniform	0.379	0.006	Non uniform	Unimodal	Late dry	-
<i>Trachops cirrhosus</i>	GA	9	808.81	0.122	Uniform	0.717	0.006	Non uniform	Bimodal	Early dry	Late dry
	Frugivores	263	28,599.91	>0.001	Non uniform	0.141	0.003	Non uniform	Bimodal	Mid wet	Late dry
	Gleaning animalivores	13	2,343.58	>0.001	Non uniform	0.418	0.006	Non uniform	Unimodal	Late dry	-

14
15
16
17
18 **Figure legends**
19

20 **Fig. 1.** Location of the Biological Dynamics of Forest Fragments Project (BDFFP), Central Amazon, Brazil
21

22
23 **Fig. 2.** Average monthly precipitation during the study period (2011-2014, solid line) relative to the long-term average (1991-2020,
24 shaded area). Pluviometry and temperature data was obtained from <http://climexp.knmi.nl>, associated with the Tropical Rainfall
25 Measuring Mission (TRMM). Data for the period 2011-2014 is based on a satellite-driven monthly precipitation index centred on
26 Manaus at -3.10N, -60.00E, 60 m altitude
27
28
29


30
31 **Fig. 3.** Reproductive phenology of the nine phyllostomid species considered for species level analysis, based on the proportion of
32 reproductive (lactating and pregnant) females for each species. Dashed grey lines show the average monthly precipitation between
33 2011 and 2014 at the BDFFP. Black circles represent the monthly proportion of adult pregnant females, black triangles represent the
34 monthly proportion of adult lactating females, and black squares represent the monthly proportion of non-reproductive adult females.
35
36
37
38


39 **Fig. 4.** Reproductive phenology of frugivorous and gleaning animalivorous phyllostomids between 2011 and 2014, determined using
40 the proportion of reproductive (lactating and pregnant) females for each ensemble. Black circles represent the monthly proportion of
41 adult pregnant females, black triangles represent the monthly proportion of adult lactating females, and black squares represent the
42 monthly proportion of non-reproductive adult females.
43
44
45
46


47 **Fig. 5.** Distribution of (a): the number of pregnant females along the year of each species and ensembles (b): the number of lactating
48 females along the year for each species and ensembles. The acronyms around the circle correspond to the six considered time periods
49 EW – early wet season; MW – mid wet season; LW – late wet season; ED – early dry season; MD – mid dry season; and, LD - late dry
50 season. Each section of the histogram displays the number of observations falling within this period. The black line running from the
51 center of the diagram to the outer edge represents the mean angle of the data with its 95% confidence limits
52
53
54
55
56

57 **Fig. 6.** Potential cover image: Dwarf little fruit bat (*Rhinophylla pumilio*) - Photo by Adrià López-Baucells
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65











Click here to access/download
Supplementary Material
Fig5.tiff





Click here to access/download
Supplementary Material
Potential_cover_image.tiff

