

Seed Dispersal Potential of Asian Elephants

Harich, Franziska K. ; Treydte, Anna Christina; Ogutu, Joseph Ochieng; Roberts, John E.; Savini, Chution; Bauer, Jan Michael; Savini, Tommaso

Document Version
Accepted author manuscript

Published in:
Acta Oecologica

DOI:
[10.1016/j.actao.2016.10.005](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actao.2016.10.005)

Publication date:
2016

License
CC BY-NC-ND

Citation for published version (APA):

Harich, F. K., Treydte, A. C., Ogutu, J. O., Roberts, J. E., Savini, C., Bauer, J. M., & Savini, T. (2016). Seed Dispersal Potential of Asian Elephants. *Acta Oecologica*, 77, 144-151.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actao.2016.10.005>

[Link to publication in CBS Research Portal](#)

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us (research.lib@cbs.dk) providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Download date: 04. Dec. 2024



Seed Dispersal Potential of Asian Elephants

**Franziska K. Harich, Anna Christina Treydte, Joseph Ochieng Ogutu, John E. Roberts,
Chution Savini, Jan Michael Bauer, and Tommaso Savini**

Journal article (Accepted version)

CITE: Seed Dispersal Potential of Asian Elephants. / Harich, Franziska K. ; Treydte, Anna Christina; Ogutu, Joseph Ochieng; Roberts, John E.; Savini, Chution; Bauer, Jan Michael; Savini, Tommaso. In: *Acta Oecologica*, Vol. 77, 2016, p. 144-151.

DOI: [10.1016/j.actao.2016.10.005](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actao.2016.10.005)

Uploaded to [Research@CBS](https://research.cbs.dk): March 2018

© 2018. This manuscript version is made available under the CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 license
<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

Seed dispersal potential of Asian Elephants

Franziska K. Harich^a, Anna C. Treydte^{a1}, Joseph O. Ogutu^b, John E. Roberts^c, Chution Savini^d, Jan M. Bauer^{e2}, Tommaso Savini^f,

^a Department of Agroecology in the Tropics and Subtropics, University of Hohenheim, Garbenstr. 13, 70593 Stuttgart, Germany. Email: harich@uni-hohenheim.de, anna@treydte.com

^b Biostatistics Unit, University of Hohenheim, Fruwirthstr. 23, 70593 Stuttgart, Germany. Email: jogutu2007@gmail.com

^c Golden Triangle Asian Elephant Foundation, 229 Moo 1, Chiang Saen, Chiang Rai 57150, Thailand. Email: jroberts@anantara.com

^d International College for Sustainability Studies, Srinakharinwirot University, 114 Sukhumvit 23, Wattana, Bangkok 10110, Thailand. Email: chutionsavini@gmail.com

^e Institute for Health Care & Public Management, University of Hohenheim, Fruwirthstr. 48, Kavaliershaus 4, 70593 Stuttgart, Germany. Email: janmbauer@gmail.com

^f Conservation Ecology Program, King Mongkut's University of Technology Thonburi, 49 Soi Tienthalay 25, Bangkhuntien-Chaithalay Road, Thakham, Bangkhuntien Bangkok 10150, Thailand.. Email: tommasosavini@gmail.com

Corresponding author: Franziska K. Harich

E-mail address: harich@uni-hohenheim.de, f.harich@gmx.de

Tel.: +49 711 459 23601; fax: +49 711 459 23629

Present address

¹ Department of Biodiversity Conservation and Ecosystem Management, Nelson Mandela African Institution of Science and Technology, Arusha, Tanzania

² Department of Intercultural Communication and Management, Copenhagen Business School, Porcelænshaven 18A, 2000 Frederiksberg, Denmark

1 **Abstract**

2 Elephants, the largest terrestrial mega-herbivores, play an important ecological role in
3 maintaining forest ecosystem diversity. While several plant species strongly rely on African
4 elephants (*Loxodonta africana*; *L. cyclotis*) as seed dispersers, little is known about the
5 dispersal potential of Asian elephants (*Elephas maximus*). We examined the effects of
6 elephant fruit consumption on potential seed dispersal using the example of a tree species
7 with mega-faunal characteristics, *Dillenia indica* Linn, in Thailand. We conducted feeding
8 trials with Asian elephants to quantify seed survival and gut passage times (GPT). In total,
9 1200 ingested and non-ingested control seeds were planted in soil and in elephant dung to
10 quantify differences in germination rates in terms of GPT and dung treatment. We used
11 survival analysis as a novel approach to account for the right-censored nature of the data
12 obtained from germination experiments. The average seed survival rate was 79% and the
13 mean GPT was 35 h. The minimum and maximum GPT were 20 h and 72 h, respectively.
14 Ingested seeds were significantly more likely to germinate and to do so earlier than non-
15 ingested control seeds ($P = 0.0002$). Seeds with the longest GPT displayed the highest
16 germination success over time. Unexpectedly, seeds planted with dung had longer
17 germination times than those planted without. We conclude that *D. indica* does not solely
18 depend on but benefits from dispersal by elephants. The declining numbers of these mega-
19 faunal seed dispersers might, therefore, have long-term negative consequences for the
20 recruitment and dispersal dynamics of populations of certain tree species.

21 *Key words: Dillenia indica, Elephas maximus, seed germination, survival analysis, Thailand*

22 **1. Introduction**

23 With ongoing forest fragmentation and losses, the seed dispersal of some tropical plants is
24 becoming increasingly hampered as populations of large seed dispersal agents are declining
25 and their movements are being restricted (Corlett 2002). This is of concern for overall forest
26 diversity as the dispersal of seeds away from the parent organism is an essential strategy used
27 by plants to find suitable establishment sites of reduced competition, herbivore or pathogen
28 attacks (Howe and Smallwood 1982; Harms et al. 2000; Willson and Traveset 2000; Corlett
29 2014). Dispersal mechanisms include abiotic drivers such as wind or water and biotic
30 dispersal modes such as endo- or epizoochory, with vertebrates as dispersal agents (van der
31 Pijl 1972; Burrows 1986; Murray 1986; Fleming and Kress 2011). A broad range of different
32 animal species can serve as seed dispersers, including birds, bats, rodents, carnivores,
33 primates and terrestrial herbivores (Howe 1986; Stiles 2000; Corlett 2014). Provided the
34 seeds can survive the consumption process, frugivorous animals, particularly the large-sized
35 animals, can disperse seeds over wide distances (Seidler and Plotkin 2006). Among large
36 herbivores, elephants are noteworthy in playing a prominent role in maintaining tree diversity
37 in forest ecosystems. With a diet comprising more than 350 different plant species, African
38 forest elephants (*Loxodonta cyclotis*) consume the broadest spectrum of fruits of all extant
39 elephant species (Blake 2002) while Asian elephants (*Elephas maximus*) reportedly forage on
40 around 100 different plant species (Sukumar 1989; Chen et al. 2006; Campos-Arceiz et al.
41 2008a; Baskaran et al. 2010; Campos-Arceiz and Blake 2011).

42
43 Hence, the range of plant species consumed by elephants varies greatly across geographic
44 regions as do their daily travel and, therefore, potential seed dispersal distances (Sukumar
45 1989). Forest elephants in Ivory Coast have been reported to cover 1-15 km / day, for an
46 average of about 6 km / day (Theuerkauf and Ellenberg 2000) whilst in northern Congo their
47 travel distance varied between 2 and 22 km / day (Blake 2002). However, the actual distances
48 over which elephants can disperse seeds can be much larger, especially for large seeds, which
49 can take several days to pass through the digestive tract (Powell 1997). Notably, travel and
50 dispersal distances of up to 57 km over a period of three days have been recorded for
51 elephants in the Congo (Blake et al. 2009). The maximum dispersal distance for Asian
52 elephants varies with geographical conditions and can range from an estimated 4 - 6 km in
53 Myanmar and 46 - 54 km in India, with 50% and >80% of seeds being dispersed over 1 km
54 distances from their origins, respectively (Campos-Arceiz et al. 2008b; Sekar et al. 2015).
55 This implies that both African and Asian elephants could potentially disperse seeds over

56 distances as large as 54 - 57 km. In tropical forests such distances are much larger than the
57 maximum dispersal distances of other seed dispersers. Distances can be more than seven
58 times longer than the maximum dispersal distance for black-casqued hornbills (*Ceratogymna*
59 *atrata*) in West Africa and about 43 times longer than the maximum recorded dispersal
60 distance for gibbons (*Hylobates mulleri x agilis*) in Borneo (Holbrook and Smith 2000;
61 McConkey 2000). Asian elephants might, therefore, rank among the most important long-
62 distance seed dispersal agents in Asia (Campos-Arceiz et al. 2008b).

63
64 Some trees have even adapted to this mode of dispersal, the so-called “megafaunal-
65 syndrome” (Janzen and Martin 1982; Guimarães Jr. et al. 2008; Blake et al. 2009; Campos-
66 Arceiz and Blake 2011). Dispersal syndrome refers to a general set of characteristics of fruits
67 and seed traits which are associated with a particular mode of dispersal, e.g. the evolvement
68 of large fruits and seeds that attract megafauna as consumers and dispersers (van der Pijl
69 1972; Janzen and Martin 1982; Howe 1985; Campos-Arceiz and Blake 2011). Several plants
70 such as *Balanites wilsoniana*, *Sacoglottis gabonensis*, *Irvingia gabonensis* and *Panda oleosa*
71 likely rely exclusively on African forest elephants as seed dispersal agents for spatial
72 distribution, increased germination success and reduced germination time with associated
73 reduced exposure to seed predators (White 1994; Cochrane 2003; Babweteera et al. 2007;
74 Blake et al. 2009; Campos-Arceiz and Blake 2011). In contrast, no such obligate seed
75 dispersal mutualism has been recorded for Asian elephants thus far and they seem to disperse
76 fewer seeds from fewer tree species than their African forest elephant counterparts. This view
77 might however be biased due to the overall poorer knowledge of Asian elephant nutritional
78 ecology (Corlett 1998; Kitamura et al. 2007; Campos-Arceiz and Blake 2011; Corlett 2014).
79 While the passage of seeds through the gut of an African elephant generally enhances
80 germination probability, there is little comparable data for the Asian elephant. One
81 experimental study that explored the influence of gut passage on seed germination in the
82 Asian elephant was disturbed too early to draw firm conclusions (Kitamura et al. 2007) whilst
83 a second study found negative effects for tamarind (*Tamarindus indica*) seeds after ingestion
84 (Campos-Arceiz et al. 2008b). In the face of declining numbers of large mammals in
85 Southeast Asia (Ripple et al. 2015), more insights into their importance for the dispersal of
86 seeds of different tree species are necessary to assess threats to forest ecosystems. Results
87 from Africa showed that the loss of elephants (and other large frugivores) negatively affects
88 the recruitment of animal-dispersed tree species, thereby fostering the development of
89 species-poor tree communities with abiotic dispersal modes (Blake et al. 2009). Animal-

90 dispersed tree populations in contrast will likely face increased clustering, contraction of their
91 geographic ranges and reduction in genetic variation if the numbers of their dispersal agents
92 decline or vanish altogether (Cramer et al. 2007; Guimarães Jr. et al. 2008;Terborgh et al.
93 2008; Markl et al. 2012; Pérez-Méndez et al. 2015).

94 Also in Southeast Asia, defaunated forests are very likely to face declines in tree diversity
95 over time (Brodie et al. 2009; Harrison et al. 2013; Caughlin et al. 2014). Large frugivores
96 like tapirs (*Tapirus indicus*) can be effective dispersers for small-seeded plants but seem to be
97 only limited substitutes for megafaunal seed dispersers (Campos-Arceiz et al. 2012). Even so,
98 few detailed studies have experimentally tested the impacts of Asian elephant fruit
99 consumption on seed dispersal efficiency and studies of their frugivory and seed dispersal
100 potential are still rare (Campos-Arceiz and Blake 2011; Corlett 2014). However, Sekar et al.
101 (2015) recently assessed the potential of domestic bovids as replacements for elephant seed
102 dispersal in India and Sekar et al. (2013) investigated the ecology of *Dillenia indica*, which is
103 known to be eaten by elephants.

104 We expand upon the studies of Sekar and Sukumar (2013) and Sekar et al. (2015) by using
105 *Dillenia indica* as an exemplary megafaunal syndrome species to empirically (i) establish
106 whether and to what extent the seeds survive gut passage, (ii) assess if the seeds that have
107 passed through the elephant gut have a higher average germination rate than control seeds that
108 have not, (iii) assess the effects of planting ingested and control seeds with or without
109 elephant dung, and (iv) quantify the degree to which the gut passage time (GPT) affects the
110 viability of seeds. With this study we also aim to highlight the importance of seed dispersal
111 for overall forest diversity and general biodiversity conservation in the context of land-use
112 changes.

113

114 **2. Materials and Methods**

115 2.1 Study site

116 The feeding and germination experiment was conducted in northern Thailand, in cooperation
117 with the Golden Triangle Asian Elephant Foundation (GTAEF), located in the border area
118 between Thailand, Myanmar and Laos (UNODC 2006; Chin 2009). The annual precipitation
119 is about 1550 - 1650 mm with a peak from June to September and a dry season from
120 December to March. The average daily temperature ranges from 25.8 °C to 27.7 °C
121 (unpublished GTAEF records). The natural vegetation of Northern Thailand is characterized
122 by a mosaic of evergreen and deciduous forest patches (Gardner et al. 2000). Elephants of the
123 foundation are ex-street begging elephants rescued to a forest environment in Northern

124 Thailand. They are partly kept in disturbed natural forest remnants, partly on grasslands in the
125 floodplains of the Ruak river, a tributary to the Mekong river, and partly in open barns. The
126 animals are sometimes used for touristic activities like riding and bathing, for an approximate
127 average of 3.5 hours and a maximum of 5 hours per day. For most of the remaining time,
128 elephants are allowed to roam in the forest or grassland, but are restricted by up to 30 m long
129 chains in the night.

130

131 2.2 Study species

132 *Dillenia indica* Linn. is an evergreen tree species of the family Dilleniaceae found throughout
133 South and Southeast Asia, including the natural habitats of the Asian elephants (Van Steenis
134 1948; Abdille et al. 2005; Sekar and Sukumar 2013). The tree can grow up to 30 m in height
135 (Van Steenis 1948; Gardner et al. 2000). Its fruits are large, around 10 cm in diameter, with
136 many small seeds of about 6 mm in length that are protected by a hard mesocarp (Van Steenis
137 1948; Abdille et al. 2005; Sekar and Sukumar 2013). No significant arboreal frugivores were
138 observed for *D. indica*; rodents as well as rhesus macaques (*Macaca mulatta*) are generally
139 unable to access the seeds but some bovids (e.g. gaur *Bos gaurus*) can consume the fruits and
140 seeds (Sekar and Sukumar 2013; Sekar et al. 2015). However, some individuals have
141 difficulties dealing with the hardness of the mesocarp and elephants were found to eat more
142 than twice as many fruits as the wild and domestic bovids combined (Sekar and Sukumar
143 2013). As the species is often found at watersides, it is not clear how much it relies on
144 elephants relative to water for its seed dispersal (Van Steenis 1948; Datta and Rawat 2008;
145 Sekar and Sukumar 2013).

146

147 2.3 Feeding trials

148 We selected six female elephants for our feeding trials, ranging in age from 6 to 35 years and
149 in body weight from 2.9 to 3.5 tons. All elephants were born in captivity with the exception of
150 the oldest one, for which no data were available. Elephants were seasonally allowed to range
151 in a nearby forest with some restrictions, but not at the time of our experiments. Their normal
152 diet of mainly grasses and various other feeds (e.g. bamboo, sugarcane, bananas) was
153 maintained during the feeding trials. The animals were regularly checked by the foundation's
154 veterinarian and were in good health. We offered the animals ripe *D. indica* fruits ad libitum.
155 The elephants were fed one at a time to facilitate a detailed monitoring of their defecation
156 time and to ensure enough manpower was available to retrieve all the dung and seeds. Before
157 being fed to the elephants, the fruits were weighed and the number of seeds they contained

158 estimated based on a regression model of seed number vs weight of control fruits (Campos-
159 Arceiz et al. 2012). We monitored the elephants throughout the day and sieved the collected
160 dung through a 2-mm wire mesh with water hoses. In the evenings, elephants were brought to
161 a barn or to resting grounds. We collected the dung defecated in the nighttime in the early
162 morning and assigned all seeds retrieved the mean time between when we stopped and
163 resumed monitoring. We then dried the collected seeds and stored them in labeled paper
164 envelopes for planting within one week of their collection date. We stopped dung collection
165 when no further seeds were found in the dung over the course of at least 12 consecutive hours.

166

167 2.4 Germination trials

168 We counted seeds extracted from elephant dung and planted them in 2l pots with commercial
169 potting soil at a nursery shaded with shadow nets. Five seeds were planted per pot and pots
170 were regularly watered. We sequentially planted the seeds retrieved from the different study
171 animals to minimize any potential negative effects of prolonged seed storage time on their
172 germination ability. As the gut passage time (GPT) as well as the deposition of seeds in dung
173 can impact seed survival and seedling growth (Lewis 1987; Nchanji and Plumptre 2001;
174 Cochrane 2003; Campos-Arceiz et al. 2008b; Campos-Arceiz and Blake 2011) we included
175 the two treatments ‘GPT’ and ‘dung’ in our germination experiments. For the GPT treatment,
176 we assigned the seeds to different GPT categories to assess the effect of GPT on the
177 germination rate or time to germination. We selected four categories: one for control and three
178 GPT categories, according to the time of peak seed retrieval and whether the levels of seed
179 loads in the dung piles were increasing or decreasing. The four categories were delineated as
180 follows (i) control: fresh and non-ingested control seeds, (ii) short: all seeds retrieved within
181 30 h of GPT ($GPT \leq 30$ h; $n = 1878$), (iii) medium: all seeds retrieved after 30 h but within 48
182 h ($30h < GPT \leq 48$ h; $n = 3797$), and (iv) long: all seeds retrieved after 48 h ($GPT > 48$ h; $n =$
183 581). For each of the six elephants, we planted a total of 200 seeds, 150 divided into the three
184 GPT categories plus 50 fresh and non-ingested control seeds. In aggregate, 1200 seeds were
185 planted. A total of 300 seeds were planted for the first GPT category plus another 300 seeds
186 for the control treatment. We planted 410 seeds for the second GPT period while for the last
187 GPT category, only 190 seeds were available due to the fast digestion of some elephants. Half
188 of all the seeds planted in each of the three GPT categories were planted in pot soil only and
189 the other half in combination with elephant dung. For the latter, the lower half of the pot was
190 filled with pot soil and the upper half was filled with elephant dung, in which the seeds were
191 placed. Germination and appearance of the first true leaves were monitored at least three

192 times per week for a period of six months. We stopped monitoring 45 days after the last seed
193 in a pot had germinated and no further germination event had occurred.

194 In addition to the single seed germination experiments, we planted two sets of whole fruits in
195 two subsequent years. In the first year, we half-buried the fruits but recorded no germination
196 success. In the second year we simply placed another 20 fruits on the ground, but
197 unfortunately the experiment was interrupted by heavy rains and flooding before any
198 germination event might have taken place. We therefore excluded this part of the experiments
199 from all analyses.

200

201 2.5 Statistical data analysis

202 As we could not definitively declare the remaining non-germinated seeds as dead, we used
203 survival analysis to calculate the germination rate as a function of time (Allison 1995; Hosmer
204 and Lemeshow 1999). An important feature of the seed germination data is that the
205 germination times are right-censored due to termination of the experiment before some seeds
206 might still have germinated. For the latter, the exact germination time, thus, remains unknown
207 and they are generally more likely to be censored. As a result, we used the censored and
208 uncensored germination times, with the time in days from planting a seed to the date of
209 germination of the seed as the response variable. We first estimated the distribution function
210 of the seed germination times, i.e., the germination time distribution function (GTDF), and
211 used this function to describe the germination times of the seeds subjected to the different
212 treatments. When evaluated at time t the GTDF yields the probability that a given seed from
213 the population of experimental seeds will have a germination time that exceeds t . This can be
214 expressed succinctly as

215

$$216 \quad G(t) = Pr(T > t) \quad (1)$$

217

218 where $G(t)$ is the germination distribution function (GTDF) and T is the germination time of a
219 randomly selected seed. We computed nonparametric estimates of the germination
220 distribution function by both the product-limit and life-table methods, also commonly called
221 the Kaplan-Meier and actuarial methods, respectively, in the SAS LIFETEST procedure (SAS
222 Institute 2016). We also computed the closely related function, the cumulative distribution
223 function (CDF):

224

$$225 \quad F(t) = 1 - G(t) \quad (2)$$

226

227 We further computed the probability density function (PDF) of the germination time, defined
228 as the derivative of $F(t)$, and denoted as $f(t)$ and the hazard function $h(t)$ defined as

229

$$230 \quad h(t) = f(t) / G(t). \quad (3)$$

231

232 We compared different germination time curves to determine whether the populations of
233 seeds subjected to different treatments had identical GTDF functions. To do this, we used
234 nonparametric k -sample tests based on weighted comparisons of the estimated hazard rate of
235 the individual populations under the null and alternative hypotheses, where k denotes the
236 number of different treatment groups being compared. We conducted several statistical tests,
237 differing in their weight functions, comprising the log-rank test, Wilcoxon test, Tarone-Ware
238 test, Peto-Peto test, modified Peto-Peto test, and Fleming-Harrington G_p family of tests. In the
239 Wilcoxon test for homogeneity, pairs of the germination time functions were compared using
240 the multiple-comparison method and the P-values for the paired tests (raw P-values) adjusted
241 for multiplicity using simulation adjustment (simulated P-values). We performed log-rank and
242 Wilcoxon test, respectively, to test the significance of the association of the germination
243 variable with covariates (category of seeds, dung treatment and planting date of seeds). These
244 tests were conducted by pooling over any defined strata, thereby adjusting for the stratum
245 variables, and were carried out using the SAS LIFEREG procedure (SAS Institute 2016).

246 If T_i is a random variable denoting the germination time and C_{i1} , D_{i2} , and t_{i3} are covariates
247 denoting the gut passage time category (0,1,2,3), dung treatment (0= without dung, 1= with
248 dung) and planting date (0, 6, 13, 20, 27, 33 days from the start of the experiment) for the i^{th}
249 seed in the sample, then the model for the association between the germination time and the
250 three covariates fitted by the LIFEREG procedure is

251

$$252 \quad \text{Log}_e(T_i) = \beta_0 + \beta_{i,1,0} C_{i,1,0} + \beta_{i,1,1} C_{i,1,1} + \beta_{i,1,2} C_{i,1,2} + \beta_{i,1,3} C_{i,1,3} + \beta_{i,2,0} D_{i,2,0} + \beta_{i,2,1} D_{i,2,1} + \beta_7 \\ 253 \quad t_{i,3} + \sigma \varepsilon_i \quad (4)$$

254

255 where ε_i is a random error term and the β s and σ (scale) are parameters to be estimated. The
256 log transformation of T_i ensures that the predicted values of T are positive regardless of the
257 values of the covariates or their regression coefficients.

258

259 **3. Results**

260 The number of fruits consumed by individual elephants during the feeding trials averaged
261 15.2 ± 6.2 ($n = 76$) and ranged between 8 and 25. The mean weight of a single fruit was 427.6
262 ± 75.4 g ($n = 188$) whereas the average number of seeds per fruit was 168.9 ± 63.5 ($n = 112$).
263 A total of 6253 ingested seeds were retrieved from the dung of five elephants over the entire
264 course of the feeding trials. For the sixth elephant we could not ensure a continuous
265 monitoring and therefore excluded this data set from survival rate calculations. The average
266 seed survival rate for five elephants was 79%, based on estimated numbers of seeds per fruit.
267 However, the regression of the number of seeds against the weight of control fruits suggested
268 a weak relationship ($r^2 = 0.12$, $P = 0.000$) albeit highly statistically significant and based on
269 an approach used by other studies (Campos-Arceiz et al. 2012; Sekar et al. 2015). This
270 implies that the reliability of the estimated survival rates of the ingested fruit seeds during
271 their passage through the elephant gut (this should not be confused with the germination rate
272 of the planted experimental seeds) was relatively low. The low reliability arises from the
273 uncertainty associated with the total number of seeds in the ingested fruits estimated from the
274 regression relationship.

275

276 The mean (± 1 SD) GPT was $35.3 (\pm 9.3)$ h, with a mean minimum of $20 (\pm 2.1)$ h and a mean
277 maximum of $72 (\pm 8.6)$ h. Of the 1200 seeds planted across all the experimental treatments,
278 68% germinated and 96% of those that germinated developed first leaves over the course of
279 the seven-month monitoring period. Until the censoring time at 167 days (plus 45 days
280 monitoring without germination event), 61% of control seeds germinated, 69% for short GPT,
281 67% for medium GPT, and 80% for long GPT, respectively. The mean germination success of
282 seed loads from different elephants was 70% or $105 (\pm 18.9)$ seeds per animal. The remaining
283 non-germinated seeds were censored (supplementary data 1). The germination time curves for
284 the four GPT categories (including the control), varied significantly in their expected mean
285 times to germination ($Z = 7.77$; $SE = 24052.94$; $P < 0.0001$; Fig 2, supplementary data 2)
286 except for categories 1 and 2 that were similar ($\chi^2 = 0.4$, $P = 0.9091$, supplementary data 3).
287 Germination times were significantly longer for the control (80%), short (29%), and medium
288 (26%) categories, than for the long GPT category (Table 1; Fig. 2). Similarly, control seeds
289 had longer expected germination times than seeds in the short ($Z = 5.24$; $SE = 0.0642$; $P <$
290 0.0001), medium ($Z = 5.96$; $SE = 0.0603$; $P < 0.0001$) and long ($Z = 8.16$; $SE = 0.0720$; $P <$
291 0.0001 ; Fig. 2, supplementary data 4) GPT categories. Dung treatment (yes, no) and planting
292 date (0, 6, 13, 20, 27, 33 days from the start of the experiment) had highly significant
293 associations with germination time as shown by the nonparametric Wilcoxon and log-rank

294 tests ($P < 0.0001$; supplementary data 5 and 6). Results of the LIFEREG procedure of SAS
295 (SAS Institute 2016) provided evidence that GPT ($\chi^2 = 72.6, P < 0.0001$), dung treatment (χ^2
296 $= 62.5, P < 0.0001$) and date of planting ($\chi^2 = 140.9, P < 0.0001$) strongly influenced
297 germination time (supplementary data 7). The parameter estimates of the regression
298 coefficients showed that the expected germination time is $[100 \times (1 - e^{-0.3567})] = 30\%$
299 significantly longer for seeds treated with dung than for the untreated seeds (Table 1, Fig.3).
300 The same applies to the median (or any other percentile) time to germination.

301

302 The percent increase in the expected germination time for each one unit increase in the
303 planting date is expressed as $[100 \times (e^{0.02505} - 1)] = 2.54\%$. This implies that each additional
304 day that passes before the seeds are planted is associated with a 2.54% increase in the
305 expected time to germination, given that the other covariates are held constant. This temporal
306 influence on germination was likely due to the changing climatic conditions over seven
307 months, with longer dry periods in between.

308

309 **4. Discussion**

310 4.1 Faster germination time for elephant-ingested seeds

311 In addition to the study of Sekar et al. (2015) in India, we used a larger sample size of
312 elephants and experimentally evaluated the influence of elephant dung itself on seed
313 germination. Furthermore, we propose and apply a different approach to analyzing
314 germination data by using statistical methods for survival analysis to reduce the potential bias
315 associated with censoring the time to germination of seeds. Our results show that *D. indica*
316 benefits from being eaten, although it does not solely depend on elephants for germination
317 (i.e., a large number of seeds also germinate without being eaten). Surviving post-germination
318 is yet another challenge and the faster germination time for seeds ingested by elephants can be
319 expected to be beneficial if it substantially reduces the risk of seed destruction by post
320 dispersal predators (Schupp 1993; Traveset and Verdú 2002; Cochrane 2003). The
321 environmental conditions of the establishing site as well as the type of seed dormancy
322 additionally influence germination speed (Crawley 2000; Traveset and Verdú 2002). Elephant
323 dung has so far been found to provide neutral or beneficial environmental conditions in the
324 form of nutrients, humidity and protection from predation (Campos-Arceiz and Blake 2011).
325 Surprisingly, we found that *D. indica* seeds planted with dung had a longer germination time
326 than seeds planted without dung, which might have been due to the limited pot size and no
327 interaction with surrounding soils and fauna. In natural conditions, the intraspecific

328 competition of large amounts of seeds deposited in the same dung pile might reduce seedling
329 success (Lewis 1987; Campos-Arceiz and Blake 2011). The seed load naturally depends on
330 how many fruits the elephants consumed, which, in our study differed across individuals, with
331 25 fruits being the maximum amount eaten. Sekar et al. (2015) observed individual
332 differences across elephants, ranging from 7 to 52 fruits of *D. indica* being eaten. Generally,
333 for elephants in natural habitats it is well documented that *D. indica* is a welcome addition to
334 their usual diet (Campos-Arceiz et al. 2008a; Datta and Rawat 2008; Sekar and Sukumar
335 2013), and the elephants in our study seem to conform with this observation.

336

337 4.2 Germination success increases with gut passage time

338 We found that *D. indica* seeds that had the longest gut passage time had the highest
339 germination success. The gut passage can have positive, negative or neutral effects on seed
340 viability (Campos-Arceiz and Blake 2011). In our study, ingested *D. indica* seeds, regardless
341 of their GPT category, had a higher germination rate compared to non-ingested control seeds.
342 One challenge in seed germination experiments is that observation time is often limited and
343 potential later germination events might be missed. Several studies have addressed this
344 challenge by testing whether the remaining non-germinated seeds contained a viable or a
345 rotten embryo (e.g. Chapman et al. 1992; Nchanji and Plumtre 2003; Campos-Arceiz et al.
346 2008b) and/or by continuing monitoring until a certain time after the last seed has germinated
347 (Campos-Arceiz et al. 2012; Sekar et al. 2015; our study). The risk of bias remains due to the
348 potential censoring of data and wrongly pronouncing potentially viable seeds as non-viable.
349 We used survival analysis to minimize both potential sources of bias (Allison 1995). The
350 proportion of germinated seeds as a function of time allowed the comparison of germination
351 success among the different categories at any given point in time until the censoring date and
352 provided information on the category-specific speed of germination.

353

354 4.3 Large dispersal distances through elephants

355 Apart from the faster germination of ingested seeds, another benefit for *D. indica* from the
356 seeds consumed by elephants might be the seed dispersal distances and their impacts on the
357 seed shadow (the distribution of viable seeds around their source; Janzen 1971; Willson and
358 Traveset 2000). Asian elephants have home ranges of 50 - 1000 km², reflecting the large area
359 across which they can alter or maintain plant composition in ecosystems (Sukumar 1989;
360 Campos-Arceiz et al. 2008b; Sukumar 2006). The seed dispersal distance by elephants varies
361 with the size of the plant seed consumed, with larger seeds taking more time to pass through

362 the digestive system (Powell 1997). *Dillenia indica* seeds (~6 mm in size) are relatively small
363 and, hence, remain in the digestive tract for a rather short time period; their maximum GPT of
364 72 h we found is much shorter than the maximum GPT of 114 h, reported for tamarind seeds
365 (*T. indica*), which are about twice as large in size (Campos-Arceiz et al. 2008b). Mean
366 dispersal distances for the latter were found to be about 1-2 km in Myanmar and Sri Lanka,
367 depending on the season (Campos-Arceiz et al. 2008b), while Sekar et al. (2015) recorded
368 mean dispersal distances of about 3.5 km for *D. indica*, *Artocarpus chaplasha*, and *Careya*
369 *arborea* in India. Tamarind seeds were negatively affected by the retention time in the gut
370 (Campos-Arceiz et al. 2008b). In contrast, *D. indica* seeds in our study profited: the longest
371 GPTs and, therefore, the largest potential dispersal distance had the highest germination
372 success. Hence, our findings highlight *D. indica*'s high adaption to and potential benefit from
373 megafaunal dispersers.

374

375 4.4 Other potential means of seed dispersal

376 With decreasing numbers of elephants and other megaherbivores as seed dispersers, plants
377 have to rely on alternative means of dispersal such as livestock, humans or water, which has
378 been reported for *D. indica* (Van Steenis 1948; Donatti et al. 2007; Datta and Rawat 2008;
379 Guimarães Jr. et al. 2008, Sekar et al. 2015). This might not apply for areas with longer dry
380 periods, where smaller animals might contribute to seed dispersal (Sekar and Sukumar 2013).
381 Elephants remove significantly more fruits than other animals such as bovids, macaques and
382 rodents but all of these species were able to access the seeds once the mesocarp had softened
383 (Sekar and Sukumar 2013). While removal does not necessarily lead to dispersal, rodents, for
384 example, are known to store seeds, thereby sometimes contributing to dispersal (Forget et al.
385 2002; Hulme 2002; Vander Wall 2002). Also macaques can serve as effective seed dispersers
386 but in several cases have negative impacts on germination and viability of some species
387 depending on the temporal context (Albert et al. 2013; Tsuji 2014). Domestic bovids, on the
388 other hand, are able to disperse a great number of seeds for some species as well, but do not
389 reach the seed dispersal capacity of elephants (Sekar et al. 2015).

390

391 4.5 Conclusion and conservation implications

392 In times of climate change, a large dispersal area might become increasingly important as it
393 might help in buffering off potential population losses due to adverse environmental
394 conditions (Corlett and Westcott 2013). However, due to increasingly intensive land use and
395 destruction of ecologically important forests, movements of large mammals are becoming

396 increasingly impeded with the result that their seed dispersal potential might either rapidly
397 decline or even disappear altogether. Large-seeded plant species in particular are at a greater
398 risk of being negatively affected by selective logging and hunting as large seed-dispersing
399 frugivores are often the first animals to vanish from disturbed forests (Markl et al. 2012).
400 Plant species experiencing the loss of their main seed dispersing animal agents might suffer
401 collapses in their recruitment and regeneration cycles (Guimarães Jr. et al. 2008; Blake et al.
402 2009). Likely consequences will be increased clustering of tree populations and lower
403 dispersal distances with associated reductions in the overall geographic range as well as losses
404 in genetic variation (Cramer et al. 2007; Guimarães Jr. et al. 2008; Terborgh et al. 2008;
405 Markl et al. 2012; Pérez-Méndez et al. 2015). Changes in species composition are to be
406 expected with particularly severe ecological shrinkage in isolated ecosystems (Hansen and
407 Galetti 2009; Markl et al. 2012).

408 Our results show that *D. indica* does not solely depend on but seems to benefit from being
409 eaten by elephants as ingested seeds were significantly more likely to germinate and to do so
410 earlier than non-ingested control seeds. With this study we contribute to the understanding of
411 the effects of Asian elephants' frugivory which has been much less researched than that of
412 African ones (Campos-Arceiz and Blake 2011). While we still know relatively little about
413 elephant seed dispersal, particularly in Asia, it is clear that elephants hold key functions in
414 forest ecosystems. The megaherbivores shape ecosystems through their high food intake and
415 by destroying vegetation through trampling or breaking, thereby acting as filters on tree
416 recruitment and shifting balances of herbaceous and woody plants (Bakker et al. 2016; Malhi
417 et al. 2016; Terborgh et al. 2016). They are likely helping to avert exceeding redundancy
418 while maintaining plant diversity and thus further decline or local loss of elephants and other
419 large herbivores would likely favor abiotically-dispersed species, leading to simpler plant
420 communities (Blake et al. 2009; Campos-Arceiz and Blake 2011). The disappearance of
421 elephants could further trigger cascading effects for overall system functioning through
422 alterations in habitat and trophic structures, leading to changes in abundance or even
423 extinction of other animal species down to potential deterioration of carbon storage and
424 disturbances of nutrient cycles (Wolf et al. 2013; Bello et al. 2015; Malhi et al. 2016). Hence,
425 their stringent protection will not only benefit the pachyderms themselves but also aid in
426 conserving the habitat for a broad range of plant and other animal species, and ultimately
427 sustaining the services such forests provide also for humankind.

428

429 **Acknowledgements**

430 We thank Richard Corlett, Ruichang Quan, Ling-Zeng Meng, Bai Zhilin and others from the
431 Xishuangbanna Tropical Botanical Gardens in China for their support in initializing this
432 study. We are very grateful to the Anantara Golden Triangle Elephant Camp and Resort and
433 the Golden Triangle Asian Elephant Foundation for their support and provision of their
434 facilities. We particularly thank Sophie Bergin, Kanokchai Beche, Virada Prabharasuk,
435 Thitibon Keratimanochaya Plotnik and six mahouts for their assistance in feeding and
436 germination experiments. Many thanks go to Samantha Chandranath Karunarathna from the
437 Mae Fah Luang University for his support. The National Research Council of Thailand
438 granted us the permit to conduct research in Thailand. This study was partly supported by the
439 German Federal Ministry of Education and Research (BMBF) within the framework of the
440 SURUMER (Sustainable Rubber Cultivation in the Mekong Region) project, under Grant
441 number FKZ 01LL0919. JOO was supported by the German Research Foundation (DFG,
442 Research Grant # OG 83/1-1).

443

444 **Author contributions**

445 FKH., ACT., TS., CS. conceived and designed the study. FKH performed the experiments
446 with the support of JER. JOO, FKH, JMB analyzed the data. FKH, ACT, JOO wrote the
447 manuscript; other co-authors provided important editorial input.

448

449 **Compliance with ethical standards**

450

451 **Conflict of Interest:** The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

452

453 **Statement of human and animal rights**

454 All applicable institutional and/or national guidelines for the care and use of animals were
455 followed.

456

457 **References**

458 Abdille MH, Singh RP, Jayaprakasha GK, Jena BS (2005) Antioxidant activity of the extracts
459 from *Dillenia indica* fruits. Food Chem 90:891-896 doi:
460 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.foodchem.2004.09.002>

461 Albert A, Hambuckers A, Culot L, Savini T, Huynen M (2013) Frugivory and seed dispersal
462 by northern pigtailed macaques (*Macaca leonina*), in Thailand. *Int J Primatol* 34:170-193
463 doi:10.1007/s10764-012-9649-5

464 Allison PD (1995) *Survival analysis using the SAS system: A practical guide*. SAS Institute
465 Inc., Cary, NC, USA

466 Babweteera F, Savill P, Brown N (2007) *Balanites wilsoniana*: Regeneration with and
467 without elephants. *Biol Conserv* 134:40-47 doi: 10.1016/j.biocon.2006.08.002

468 Bakker ES, Gill JL, Johnson CN, Vera FWM, Sandom CJ, Asner GP, Svenning J (2016).
469 Combining paleo-data and modern exclosure experiments to assess the impact of megafauna
470 extinctions on woody vegetation. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 113:847-855 DOI
471 10.1073/pnas.1502545112

472 Baskaran N, Balasubramanian M, Swaminathan S, Desai AA (2010) Feeding ecology of the
473 Asian elephant *Elephas maximus* linnaeus in the Nilgiri Biosphere Reserve, Southern India.
474 *Journal of the Bombay Natural History Society*, 107(1), Jan-Apr 2010 107:3-13

475 Bello C, Galetti M, Pizo MA, Magnago LFS, Rocha MF, Lima RAF, Peres CA, Ovaskainen
476 O, Jordano P (2015). Defaunation affects carbon storage in tropical forests. *Science Advances*
477 1:1-10 doi 10.1126/sciadv.1501105

478 Blake S, Deem SL, Mossimbo E, Maisels F, Walsh P (2009) Forest elephants: Tree planters
479 of the Congo. *Biotropica* 41:459-468 doi: 10.1111/j.1744-7429.2009.00512.x

480 Blake S (2002) The ecology of forest elephant distribution and its implications for
481 conservation. PhD dissertation, Institute of Cell, Animal, and Population Biology, University
482 of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, Scotland.

483 Brodie JF, Helmy OE, Brockelman WY, Maron JL (2009) Bushmeat poaching reduces the
484 seed dispersal and population growth rate of a mammal-dispersed tree. *Ecol Appl* 19:854-863
485 doi: 10.1890/08-0955.1

486 Burrows FM (1986) The aerial motion of seeds, fruits, spores and pollen. In: DR Murray (ed)
487 *Seed dispersal*. Academic Press Australia, Australia, pp 2-47

- 488 Campos-Arceiz A, Lin T, Htun W, Takatsuki S, Leimgruber P (2008a) Working with
489 mahouts to explore the diet of work elephants in Myanmar (Burma). *Ecological Research*
490 23:1057-1064 doi: 10.1007/s11284-008-0466-4
- 491 Campos-Arceiz A, Larrinaga AR, Weerasinghe U, Takatsuki S, Pastorini J, Leimgruber P,
492 Fernando P, Santamaría L (2008b) Behavior rather than diet mediates seasonal differences in
493 seed dispersal by Asian elephants. *Ecology* 89:pp. 2684-2691 doi: 10.1890/07-1573.1
- 494 Campos-Arceiz A, Blake S (2011) Megagardeners of the forest – the role of elephants in seed
495 dispersal. *Acta Oecol* 37:542-553 doi: 10.1016/j.actao.2011.01.014
- 496 Campos-Arceiz A, Traeholt C, Jaffar R, Santamaria L, Corlett RT (2012) Asian tapirs are no
497 elephants when it comes to seed dispersal. *Biotropica* 44:220-227 doi: 10.1111/j.1744-
498 7429.2011.00784.x
- 499 Caughlin TT, Ferguson JM, Lichstein JW, Zuidema PA, Bunyavejchewin S, Levey DJ (2014)
500 Loss of animal seed dispersal increases extinction risk in a tropical tree species due to
501 pervasive negative density dependence across life stages. *Proc R Soc B Biol Sci* 282:1-9 doi:
502 10.1098/rspb.2014.2095
- 503 Chapman LJ, Chapman CA, Wrangham RW (1992) *Balanites wilsoniana*: Elephant
504 dependent dispersal? *J Trop Ecol* 8:275-283
- 505 Chen J, Deng X, Zhang L, Bai Z (2006) Diet composition and foraging ecology of Asian
506 elephants in Shangyong, Xishuangbanna, China. *Acta Ecologica Sinica* 26:309-316
507 doi:10.1016/S1872-2032(06)60006-1
- 508 Chin K (2009) *The Golden Triangle: Inside Southeast Asia's drug trade*, 1st edn. Cornell
509 University Press, New York, USA
- 510 Cochrane EP (2003) The need to be eaten: *Balanites wilsoniana* with and without elephant
511 seed-dispersal. *J Trop Ecol* 19:579-589
- 512 Corlett RT (2014) *The ecology of tropical East Asia*, 2nd edn. Oxford University Press,
513 Oxford, UK

514 Corlett RT, Westcott DA (2013) Will plant movements keep up with climate change? Trends
515 in Ecology & Evolution 28:482-488 doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2013.04.003>

516 Corlett RT (2002) Frugivory and seed dispersal in degraded tropical East Asian landscapes.
517 In: DJ Levey, WR Silva and M Galetti (eds) Seed Dispersal and Frugivory: Ecology,
518 Evolution and Conservation. CAB International, Oxon, UK and New York, USA, pp 451-465

519 Corlett RT (1998) Frugivory and seed dispersal by vertebrates in the Oriental (Indomalayan)
520 region. Biological Reviews 73:413-448 doi: 10.1111/j.1469-185X.1998.tb00178.x

521 Cramer JM, Mesquita RCG, Williamson GB (2007) Forest fragmentation differentially affects
522 seed dispersal of large and small-seeded tropical trees. Biol Conserv 137:415-423 doi:
523 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2007.02.019>

524 Crawley MJ (2000) Seed predators and plant population dynamics. In: M Fenner (ed) Seeds:
525 The Ecology of Regeneration in Plant Communities. CAB International, Wallingford, UK, pp
526 167-182

527 Datta A, Rawat GS (2008) Dispersal modes and spatial patterns of tree species in a tropical
528 forest in Arunachal Pradesh, Northeast India. Tropical Conservation Science 1:163-185

529 Donatti CI, Galetti M, Pizo MA, Guimarães Jr. P.R. PR, Jordano P (2007). Living in the land
530 of ghosts: Fruit traits and the importance of large mammals as seed dispersers in the pantanal,
531 brazil. In: AJ Dennis, EW Schupp, RJ Green and DA Westcott (eds) Seed Dispersal: Theory
532 and its Application in a Changing World. CAB International, Oxfordshire, UK, pp 104-123

533 Fleming TH, Kress WJ (2011) A brief history of fruits and frugivores. Acta Oecol 37:521-530
534 doi: 10.1016/j.actao.2011.01.016

535 Forget PM, Hammond DS, Milleron T, Thomas R (2002) Seasonality of fruiting and food
536 hoarding by rodents in neotropical forests: Consequences for seed dispersal and seedling
537 recruitment. In: DJ Levey, WR Silva and M Galetti (eds) Seed dispersal and frugivory:
538 ecology, evolution and conservation. CABI Publishing, Wallingford, UK, pp 241-256

539 Gardner S, Sidisunthorn P, Anusarnsunthorn V (2000) A field guide to forest trees of northern
540 Thailand, 1st edn. Kobfai Publishing Project, Bangkok, Thailand

541 Guimarães Jr. PR, Galetti M, Jordano P (2008) Seed dispersal anachronisms: Rethinking the
542 fruits extinct megafauna ate. PLoS ONE 3(3): e1745. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0001745

543 Hansen DM, Galetti M (2009). The forgotten megafauna. Science 324:42-43 DOI
544 10.1126/science.1172393

545 Harms KE, Wright SJ, Calderón O, Hernández A, Herre EA (2000) Pervasive density-
546 dependent recruitment enhances seedling diversity in a tropical forest. Nature 404:493-495
547 doi:10.1038/35006630

548 Harrison RD, Tan S, Plotkin JB, Slik F, Detto M, Brenes T, Itoh A, Davies SJ (2013)
549 Consequences of defaunation for a tropical tree community. Ecol Lett 16:687-694 doi:
550 10.1111/ele.12102

551 Holbrook KM, Smith TB (2000) Seed dispersal and movement patterns in two species of
552 *Ceratogymna* hornbills in a West African tropical lowland forest. Oecologia 125:249-257 doi:
553 10.1007/s004420000445

554 Hosmer DW, Lemeshow S (1999) Applied survival analysis, 1st edn. Wiley, New York, USA

555 Howe HF (1986) Seed dispersal by fruit-eating birds and mammals. In: DR Murray (ed) Seed
556 dispersal. Academic Press Australia, Australia, pp 123-189

557 Howe HF (1985) Gomphothere fruits: A critique. Am Nat 125:853-865

558 Howe HF, Smallwood J (1982) Ecology of seed dispersal. Annu Rev Ecol Syst 13:201-228
559 doi: 10.1146/annurev.es.13.110182.001221

560 Hulme PE (2002) Seed-eaters: Seed dispersal, destruction and demography. In: DJ Levey,
561 WR Silva and M Galetti (eds) Seed dispersal and frugivory: ecology, evolution and
562 conservation. CABI Publishing, Wallingford, UK, pp 257-273

563 Janzen DH, Martin PS (1982) Neotropical anachronisms: The fruits the gomphotheres ate.
564 Science 215:19-27 doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1126/science.215.4528.19>

565 Janzen DH (1971) Seed predation by animals. Annu Rev Ecol Syst 2:465-492 doi:
566 10.1146/annurev.es.02.110171.002341

567 Kitamura S, Yumoto T, Poonswad P, Wohandee P (2007) Frugivory and seed dispersal by
568 Asian elephants, *Elephas maximus*, in a moist evergreen forest of Thailand. J Trop Ecol
569 23:373 doi: 10.1017/S0266467407004026

570 Lewis DM (1987) Fruiting patterns, seed germination, and distribution of *Sclerocarya caffra*
571 in an elephant-inhabited woodland. Biotropica 19:50-56 doi: 10.2307/2388459

572 Malhi Y, Doughty CE, Galetti M, Smith FA, Svenning J-, Terborgh JW (2016). Megafauna
573 and ecosystem function from the pleistocene to the anthropocene. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A
574 113:838-846 DOI 10.1073/pnas.1502540113

575 Markl JS, Schleuning M, Forget PM, Jordano P, Lambert JE, Traveset A, Wright SJ,
576 Böhning-Gaese K (2012) Meta-analysis of the effects of human disturbance on seed dispersal
577 by animals. Conserv Biol 26:1072-1081 doi: 10.1111/j.1523-1739.2012.01927.x

578 McConkey KR (2000) Primary seed shadow generated by gibbons in the rain forests of Barito
579 Ulu, Central Borneo. Am J Primatol 52:13-29 doi: 10.1002/1098-
580 2345(200009)52:1<13::AID-AJP2>3.0.CO;2-Y

581 Murray DR (1986) Seed dispersal by water. In: DR Murray (ed) Seed dispersal. Academic
582 Press Australia, Australia, pp 49-85

583 Nchanji AC, Plumptre AJ (2001) Seasonality in elephant dung decay and implications for
584 censusing and population monitoring in south-western Cameroon. Afr J Ecol 39:24-32 doi:
585 10.1111/j.1365-2028.2001.00265.x

586 Nchanji AC, Plumptre AJ (2003) Seed germination and early seedling establishment of some
587 elephant-dispersed species in Banyang-Mbo Wildlife Sanctuary, south-western Cameroon. J
588 Trop Ecol 19:229-237 doi: 10.1017/S0266467403003262

589 Pérez-Méndez N, Jordano P, Valido A (2015). Downsized mutualisms: Consequences of seed
590 dispersers' body-size reduction for early plant recruitment. Perspect Plant Ecol Evol Syst
591 17:151-159 DOI 10.1016/j.ppees.2014.12.001

592 Powell JA (1997) The ecology of forest elephants (*loxodonta africana cyclotis matschie*
593 1900) in Banyang-Mbo and Korup forests, Cameroon with particular reference to their role as
594 seed dispersal agents, Ph.D. Dissertation. University of Cambridge, Cambridge, UK

595 Ripple WJ, Newsome TM, Wolf C, Dirzo R, Everatt KT, Galetti M, Hayward MW, Kerley
596 GIH, Levi T, Lindsey PA, Macdonald DW, Malhi Y, Painter LE, Sandom CJ, Terborgh J,
597 Van Valkenburgh B (2015). Collapse of the world's largest herbivores. *Science Advances*
598 1:1-12 doi 10.1126/sciadv.1400103

599 Schupp EW (1993) Quantity, quality and the effectiveness of seed dispersal by animals.
600 *Vegetatio* 107-108:15-29 doi: 10.1007/BF00052209

601 Seidler TG, Plotkin JB (2006) Seed dispersal and spatial pattern in tropical trees. *PLoS Biol*
602 4:2132-2137 doi:10.1371/journal.pbio.0040344

603 Sekar N, Lee C, Sukumar R (2015) In the elephant's seed shadow: The prospects of domestic
604 bovids as replacement dispersers of three tropical Asian trees. *Ecology* 96:2093-2105 doi:
605 10.1890/14-1543.1

606 Sekar N, Sukumar R (2013) Waiting for gajah: An elephant mutualist's contingency plan for
607 an endangered megafaunal disperser. *J Ecol* 101:1379-1388 doi: 10.1111/1365-2745.12157

608 Stiles EW (2000) Animals as seed dispersers. In: M Fenner (ed) *Seeds: The Ecology of*
609 *Regeneration in Plant Communities*. CAB International, UK, pp 111-124

610 Sukumar R (2006) A brief review of the status, distribution and biology of wild Asian
611 elephants *Elephas maximus*. *International Zoo Yearbook* 40:1-8 doi: 10.1111/j.1748-
612 1090.2006.00001.x

613 Sukumar R (1989) *The Asian Elephant : Ecology and management*, 1. Publ. edn. Cambridge
614 University Press, Cambridge

615 Terborgh J, Nuñez-Iturri G, Pitman NCA, Valverde FHC, Alvarez P, Swamy V, Pringle EG,
616 Paine CET (2008) Tree recruitment in an empty forest. *Ecology* 89:1757-1768 doi:
617 10.1890/07-0479.1

618 Terborgh J, Davenport LC, Niangadouma R, Dimoto E, Mouandza JC, Scholtz O, Jaen MR
619 (2016). Megafaunal influences on tree recruitment in african equatorial forests. *Ecography*
620 39:180-186 DOI 10.1111/ecog.01641

621 Theuerkauf J, Ellenberg H (2000) Movements and defaecation of forest elephants in the moist
622 semi-deciduous Bossematié Forest Reserve, Ivory Coast. *Afr J Ecol* 38:258-261 doi:
623 10.1046/j.1365-2028.2000.00240.x

624 Traveset A, Verdú M (2002) A meta-analysis of the effect of gut treatment on seed
625 germination. In: DJ Levey, WR Silva and M Galetti (eds) *Seed dispersal and frugivory:*
626 *ecology, evolution and conservation*. CABI Publishing, Wallingford, UK, pp 339-350

627 Tsuji Y (2014) Inter-annual variation in characteristics of endozoochory by wild Japanese
628 macaques. *PLoS ONE* 9:e108155 doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0108155

629 UNODC (2006) *Opium poppy cultivation in the Golden Triangle: Lao PDR, Myanmar,*
630 *Thailand*. United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, Wien, UNODC

631 van der Pijl L (1972) *Principles of dispersal in higher plants*, 2d ed. edn. Springer, Berlin

632 Van Steenis, C.G.G.J. (general editor) (1948) *Flora Malesiana*. series I, seed plants., Volume
633 4, Part 1. Noordhoff-Kolff N.V., Djakarta

634 Vander Wall SB (2002) Secondary dispersal of Jeffrey pine seeds by rodent scatter-hoarders:
635 The roles of pilfering, recaching and a variable environment. In: DJ Levey, WR Silva and M
636 Galetti (eds) *Seed dispersal and frugivory: ecology, evolution and conservation*. CABI
637 Publishing, Wallingford, UK, pp 193-208

638 White LJT (1994) *Sacoglottis gabonensis* fruiting and the seasonal movements of elephants in
639 the Lopé Reserve, Gabon. *J Trop Ecol* 10:121-125 doi: 10.1017/S0266467400007768

640 Willson MF, Traveset A (2000) The ecology of seed dispersal. In: M Fenner (ed) *Seeds: The*
641 *Ecology of Regeneration in Plant Communities*. CAB International, UK, pp 85-110

642 Wolf A, Doughty CE, Malhi Y (2013). Lateral diffusion of nutrients by mammalian
643 herbivores in terrestrial ecosystems. *PLoS ONE* 8 DOI 10.1371/journal.pone.0071352

Table 1. Maximum likelihood parameter estimates for the model relating germination time to the gut passage time (GPT) categories (control, short, medium, long), dung treatment (yes, no) and date of planting seeds. The null hypothesis is that all the coefficients are 0. $exp(\beta)$ is the estimated ratio of the expected (mean) germination times. CL= 95% confidence limits.

<i>Parameter</i>	<i>Level</i>	<i>exp (β)</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>Lower CL</i>	<i>Upper CL</i>	χ^2	<i>P</i>
Intercept		4.021	0.067	3.891	4.152	3662.7	< 0.0001
GPT	Control	0.588	0.072	0.447	0.729	66.6	< 0.0001
	Short	0.251	0.071	0.112	0.391	12.4	0.0004
	Medium	0.229	0.068	0.095	0.363	11.3	0.0008
	Long	0.000					
Dung	Yes	-0.357	0.045	-0.445	-0.268	62.5	< 0.0001
	No	0.000					
Date		0.025	0.002	0.021	0.029	140.9	< 0.0001
Scale		0.746	0.020	0.708	0.786		

List of Figures

644 Figure 1. Mean proportion (red line) and 95% confidence band (green shaded area) of
645 germinated seeds across all categories as a function of time to germination. Germination rate
646 =1- proportion of non-germinated seeds. The vertical dashed lines mark the beginning of
647 germination and the right-censoring date, respectively. Monitoring of seeds was continued for
648 45 days after the date of the last germination event.

649 Figure 2. The proportion of germinated seeds as a function of time for the control group (not
650 ingested) and the three gut passage time (GPT) treatment groups (short: $GPT \leq 30$ h, medium:
651 $30 \text{ h} < GPT \leq 48$ h, long: $GPT > 48$ h) and the pointwise 95% confidence bands. Germination
652 rate =1- proportion of non-germinated seeds.

653 Figure 3. The proportion of germinated seeds as a function of time since planting in days for
654 the seeds planted with dung and without dung and the 95% pointwise confidence bands.
655 Germination rate =1- proportion of non-germinated seeds.




Figure 1




Figure 2




Figure 3

