

Termite mound cover and abundance respond to herbivore-mediated biotic changes in a Kenyan savanna

Grace K. Charles^{1,2,6}, Corinna Riginos^{2,3}, Kari E. Veblen^{2,4}, Duncan M. Kimuyu^{2,5}, Truman P. Young¹,

¹Department of Plant Sciences, University of California, Davis, CA 95616

²Mpala Research Centre, PO Box 555, Nanyuki, Kenya, 10400

³The Nature Conservancy, Lander, Wyoming, 82520

⁴Department of Wildland Resources and Ecology Center, Utah State University, Logan, UT, 84322

⁵Department of Natural Resource Management, Karatina University, Karatina, Kenya, 10101

⁶Corresponding Author: gcharles@ucdavis.edu

Author contributions: GKC, CR, KEV, and TPY conceived the ideas and designed methodology; GKC, DMK, KEV, CR, and TPY collected the data; GKC analyzed the data; GKC led the writing of the manuscript. All authors contributed critically to the drafts and gave final approval for publication.

Data Accessibility Statement

Data for this paper are archived at:

<https://figshare.com/articles/dataset/>

[Data to accompany Termite mound cover and abundance respond to herbivore-mediated biotic changes in an African savanna /13557902](https://figshare.com/articles/dataset/Data_to_accompany_Termite_mound_cover_and_abundance_respond_to_herbivore-mediated_biotic_changes_in_an_African_savanna_/13557902)

24 **Abstract**

25 Both termites and large mammalian herbivores (LMH) are savanna ecosystem engineers that
26 have profound impacts on ecosystem structure and function. Both of these savanna engineers
27 modulate many common and shared dietary resources such as woody and herbaceous plant
28 biomass, yet few studies have addressed how they impact one another. In particular, it is unclear
29 how herbivores may influence the abundance of long-lived termite mounds via changes in
30 termite dietary resources such as woody and herbaceous biomass. While it has long been
31 assumed that abundance and areal cover of termite mounds in the landscape remains relatively
32 stable, most data are observational, and few experiments have tested how termite mound patterns
33 may respond to biotic factors such as changes in large herbivore communities. Here, we use a
34 broad tree density gradient and two landscape-scale experimental manipulations—the first a
35 multi-guild large herbivore exclosure experiment and the second a tree removal experiment-- to
36 demonstrate that patterns in termite mound abundance and cover are unexpectedly dynamic.
37 Termite mound abundance, but not areal cover not significantly, is positively associated with
38 experimentally controlled presence of cattle, but not wild mesoherbivores (15-1000 kg) or
39 megaherbivores (elephants and giraffes). Herbaceous productivity and tree density, termite
40 dietary resources that significantly affected by different LMH treatments, are both positive
41 predictors of termite mound abundance. Experimental reductions of tree densities are associated
42 with lower abundances of termite mounds. These results reveal a richly interacting web of
43 relationships among multiple savanna ecosystem engineers and suggest that termite mound
44 abundance and areal cover is intimately tied to herbivore-driven resource availability.

45 Key words: ecosystem engineers, exclosure experiments, large mammalian herbivores, livestock,
46 tree thinning, *Odontotermes*

47

48 **Introduction**

Understanding the causes and controls of community heterogeneity and structure has long been a goal of ecologists and can provide insight into broader ecosystem dynamics (Tews et al. 2004; Lundholm 2009; Stevens and Tello 2011). Ecosystem engineers, organisms that create and modify habitats, are widespread worldwide and can drive ecological and evolutionary patterns (Jones et al. 1994; Jones et al. 1997; Wright and Jones 2006). Ecosystem engineers can create ‘patches’ of contrasting habitats (e.g., beaver dams, coral reefs, salt marshes, termite mounds, wallows, grazing lawns) that are important sources of habitat heterogeneity (Crooks 2002; Boogert et al. 2006). Some patch types may persist over time periods ranging from years to millennia (Jones et al. 1997; Hastings et al. 2007; Romero et al. 2014). The effects of ecosystem engineers on landscape heterogeneity depend on their interactions and feedbacks with biotic and abiotic environmental drivers (Wright et al. 2004; Romero et al. 2014).

A number of studies have theoretically explored the dynamics of the abundance, longevity, and stability of engineered patches (Gurney and Lawton 1996; Wright et al. 2004; Hastings et al. 2007; Cuddington et al. 2009). However, these dynamics have rarely been tested experimentally (but see Porensky and Veblen 2015, Lagendijk et al. 2016). Models predict that the proportion of landscape occupied as engineered patches versus background habitat depends on the population size, density-dependent feedbacks, and behavior of ecosystem engineers (Wright et al. 2004; Cuddington et al. 2009; Wright 2009). Changes in abiotic or biotic conditions may alter ecosystem engineer resource availability and population dynamics, therefore changing the proportion of engineered landscape. For example, an increase in dietary resources could lead to a population increase of ecosystem engineers and, subsequently, the proportion of engineered landscape.

One globally-distributed type of ecosystem engineer, termites, create mounds that generate landscape heterogeneity by locally enriching soil (Jones 1990), altering biogeochemical cycles (Fox-Dobbs et al. 2010), changing hydrology and soil structure (Mando et al. 1996; Mando 1997), and shifting plant palatability and community structure (Okullo and Moe 2012). Termite mounds can positively influence the productivity, biodiversity, and resilience of savanna

ecosystems (Pringle et al. 2010; Okullo and Moe 2012; Joseph et al. 2014; Bonachela et al. 2015). Fungus-cultivating termites are known to consume a wide diet that includes live and dead wood and herbaceous material, as well as animal byproducts such as dung and hooves (Wood 1978; Freymann et al. 2007; Freymann et al. 2008). Understanding the drivers of termite mound abundance can provide important insight into patterns in savanna ecosystem heterogeneity and biodiversity.

Recent work has shown that termite mound abundance and distribution both in space and time may be modulated by variation in abiotic and biotic resources. Termite mound abundance can vary with changes in soil type, rainfall, ecosystem productivity, and herbivore presence (Havery et al. 1975; Korb and Linsenmair 2001; Davies et al. 2014) and appears to increase with availability of dietary resources such as tree density (Levick et al. 2010; Davies et al. 2014). Some evidence also suggests that termite diets may shift in response to changing availability of plant resources (Boutton et al. 1983; Lepage et al. 1993).

Mature (larger) termite mounds are often regularly spaced (overdispersed) in the landscape (Pringle et al. 2010; Grohmann et al. 2010; Sileshi et al. 2010; Davies et al. 2014); these regular-spaced arrangements of mature mounds have led some to infer that termite mound abundance and the proportion of engineered habitat is relatively stable in space and time (Pringle and Tarnita 2017). However, the temporal stability of these patterns is not well-understood. On the one hand, some termite mounds in Africa have been found to be hundreds to thousands of years old (Erens et al. 2015) and studies have reported landscape-scale stability in mound abundance over multi-year periods (Pomeroy 2005). On the other hand, some studies have observed that termite activity, abundance, and diversity can change in response to habitat disturbance over decadal time scales (Eggleton et al. 2002; Jones et al. 2003). However, to date, most studies of termite mound abundance have relied only on observations of their natural abundance.

Termites are deeply embedded in savanna food webs and rely on dietary resources such as woody and herbaceous plant biomass that are strongly impacted by large mammalian

herbivores. Browsing by cattle and wild ungulate herbivores can lead to changes in savanna grass, shrub, and tree density and diversity (Goheen et al. 2010; Odadi et al. 2011; Lagendijk et al. 2012; Goheen et al. 2013; Young et al. 2013; Pringle et al. 2014; Veblen et al. 2016). Elephants in particular are known to radically affect landscape heterogeneity by increasing the availability of downed woody debris in the short-term (Holdo and McDowell 2004; Kerley et al. 2008) and by reducing woody density and cover in the long-term (Laws 1970; Whyte et al. 2003; De Beer et al. 2006). Herbivory by domestic and wild herbivores is also known to affect various other ecosystem traits, including herbaceous productivity (Charles et al. 2016) and nutrient cycling (Sitters et al. 2014; Sitters and Olde Venterink 2015, Sitters et al. 2020). Recent studies have sought to understand how changes in herbivore communities may impact termites abundance and diversity (Freyman et al. 2010; Seymour et al. 2016; Lagendijk et al. 2016). Although several studies have hypothesized feedback loops between mammalian herbivores and termites via changes in the availability of plant material (Freyman et al. 2010; Levick et al. 2010), few have tested these relationships experimentally (Lagendijk et al. 2016).

In this study, we examined how changes in savanna plant and herbivore community structure impacted the abundance of termite mounds. We used landscape-scale variation in tree density and two long-term experiments to measure the responses of termites to changes in resource abundance. We quantified termite mound abundance and areal cover a) along a gradient of tree density, b) in tree thinning plots and c) in the Kenya Long-term Exclosure Experiment (KLEE), a series of experimental plots that have excluded different combinations of elephants, other large wildlife, and cattle for the past two decades.

Methods

Study Site

We conducted this research at Mpala Research Centre (0° 17' N, 36° 52' E) in central Kenya in a wooded grassland on “black cotton” vertisol soils. These high-clay soils are characterized by shrink-swell dynamics, impeded drainage, and relatively high nutrient content. Plant

communities in this system are relatively species-rich (>100 species), but dominated by five grass species that account for 85% of the herbaceous cover (see Appendix 1 in Porensky et al. 2013). The overstory of this wooded grassland ecosystem is dominated by *Acacia drepanolobium*, which accounts for 97% of woody cover (Young et al. 1998). The study area is host to both native and domestic mammalian ungulates, including domesticated cattle (*Bos taurus indicus*), plains zebra (*Equus quagga*), Grevy's zebra (*Equus grevyi*), African elephant (*Loxodonta africana*), giraffe (*Giraffa camelopardalis*), Grant's gazelle (*Gazella grantii*), African buffalo *Syncerus caffer*), hartebeest (*Alcelaphus buselaphus*), eland (*Taurotragus oryx*), oryx (*Oryx beisa*), and steinbuck (*Raphicerus campestris*). For their relative abundances, see Table 1 in Veblen et al. (2016).

Odontotermes sp. termite mounds occur across this landscape (Pringle et al. 2010). *Odontotermes* mounds are slightly raised (<1m) and have aboveground diameters ranging from <1m – 20m. The larger, more conspicuous mounds are hyper-dispersed (Pringle et al. 2010). In other species of fungus-growing *Odontotermes* and *Macrotermes* termites, parameters including termite mound area have been shown to be strongly positively correlated with both termite colony population size and age (Collins 1981; Darlington and Dransfield 1987). Soils on mounds (in black cotton) are altered both chemically and physically, characterized by lower clay content and higher silt content (Darlington 1985) and elevated soil and plant nutrient content (Brody et al. 2010).

Experimental manipulations (and a natural gradient)

We used two large-scale manipulation experiments to test how termite mound densities responded to changes in large herbivore communities and two important termite dietary resources, woody biomass (here measured as tree density) and herbaceous aboveground net primary productivity (ANPP).

Kenya Long-term Exclosure Experiment (KLEE)

First, we surveyed abundance of termite mounds and termite dietary resources in the KLEE

plots. KLEE was established in 1995 to examine how native and domestic large mammalian herbivores impact each other and their shared savanna ecosystem (Young et al. 1998). KLEE consists of eighteen 4-hectare plots with semi-permeable barriers that excluded different combinations of cattle ('C'), mesoherbivore wildlife >15kg ('W'), and megaherbivores (elephants and giraffes; 'M'). There are six treatments, each of which is replicated over three blocks: O, C, W, WC, MW, and MWC (Fig. 1; for more details, see Young et al. 1998). The capital letter of each plot represent which herbivores are allowed access: 'O' plots allow no herbivores >15kg, 'C' plots allow only cattle access, 'W' plots allow only mesoherbivore wildlife access, 'WC' plots allow access by both cattle and mesoherbivores, 'MW' plots allow access by mesoherbivores and megaherbivores, and 'MWC' plots allow access by mesoherbivores, megaherbivores, and cattle. In C, WC, and MWC plots, herded groups of 100-120 head of cattle are grazed 3-4 times per year, depending on forage availability. This grazing regime reflects a moderate stocking rate similar to the overall Mpala Ranch stocking rate (Odadi et al. 2007). Grazing rates are standardized across all KLEE plots.

We surveyed termite mounds in KLEE in May 2014 and again in July 2015. *Odontotermes* mounds in this ecosystem are generally treeless and tend to be dominated by the perennial bunchgrass *Pennisetum stramineum* (Pringle et al. 2010). Active termite mounds also feature vents for nest ventilation and humidity control (Pomeroy 2005). In addition to topographical features, the edges of *Odontotermes spp.* termite mounds can be delineated from background vegetation by a visible shift in plant community composition. Combined, these features make mounds generally visible from a distance of well over ten meters, though small mounds can be hard to identify until in closer proximity. We conducted comprehensive searches for termite mounds by walking parallel 10m-wide transects covering the entire area of every 4-ha KLEE plot. We excluded from our surveys termite-rich anthropogenic glades that developed from long-abandoned cattle corrals (see Veblen 2012). For both surveys, we used a Trimble Juno 3B GPS to record the center and footprint of each mound.

To explore whether resource limitation is a driver of termite mound abundance, we

quantified variation of two important termite dietary resources in the KLEE plots: tree density along a natural gradient across KLEE plots, and herbaceous productivity among KLEE treatments. KLEE plot tree densities were measured in the central hectare of all 18 KLEE plots in January - March 2015. Tree density across KLEE blocks increases along a natural gradient from north to south. This tree density gradient occurs across an area with no measurable differences in precipitation, but significant differences in soil texture. These differences in soil texture correlate with differences in tree density (Riginos and Grace 2008). Tree density in KLEE is strongly positively correlated with the abundance of fine woody debris (Kimuyu et al. 2014). We used a series of productivity cages to quantify aboveground herbaceous net primary productivity in each of the the 18 KLEE plots (ANPP; See Charles et al. 2016 for details) and calculated plot-level ANPP estimates by averaging measurements taken over ten collection periods from 2010 to 2012.

Tree Removal Ecosystem Experiment (TREE)

As an experimental test of patterns from the natural gradient in tree density, in early 2006, and then again in May 2014, we also collected termite mound data from the Tree Removal Ecosystem Experiment (TREE), an experiment established in March 2006 (Riginos 2014). A total of 25 plots are located on Mpala Research Center and directly adjacent Jessel Ranch (Fig. 1). Plots are open and accessible to wild herbivores (similar to the MWC treatments in KLEE). While wildlife populations are comparable between these two ranches, cattle are stocked at higher rates on this part of Jessel Ranch than this part of Mpala (C. Riginos, unpublished data). These experimental plots measure 60m x 60m and have one of three treatments: control (N = 10), thinned tree densities (N = 5), and total tree removal (N = 10). In thinned plots, we removed a randomly-selected set of two thirds of trees within each half-meter size class (with trees ranging from <50 cm to >5m) in order to maintain tree size class structure. These 25 plots are located along a natural north-south gradient in tree density ~4km in length, with pre-manipulation tree densities ranging from 268 to 2784 trees ha⁻¹ and post-treatment tree densities ranging from 0 to 2219 trees ha⁻¹ (including controls). For additional details, see Riginos (2014).

209 All tree removal plots are located within 2 km of KLEE on the same black cotton vertisols and
210 are placed in locations with no signs of recent disturbance from fire or humans.

211 In TREE, we counted and mapped termite mound abundance in 2006 prior to tree
212 removals, and then again in 2014 after eight years of tree manipulation. For our 2006 mound
213 survey, we recorded and hand-mapped the locations of all termite mounds within each plot
214 relative to a 10 x 10 m grid of tapes laid out in each plot. For our 2014 survey, we used a
215 Trimble Juno 3B GPS with meter-level accuracy to record the center and footprint of each
216 mound.

217 *Statistical analyses*

218 All analyses were carried out in R version 3.3.2. We used linear mixed models (LMMs) to
219 determine which factors were best predictors of termite dietary resource availability, individual
220 termite mound size, and termite mound areal cover and abundance. We used the nlme package
221 (Pinheiro et al. 2015). We checked the normality and homoscedasticity of the residuals of all
222 models to make assure that they met assumptions. We used Tukey's HSD analyses for post-hoc
223 comparisons of different herbivore treatments. We used the MuMIn package (Bartón 2018) to
224 calculate the marginal and conditional R² values for our models (i.e. the variance explained by
225 only fixed effects and the variance explained by both fixed and random effects, respectively).

226 In KLEE, we first asked how termite mound abundance, areal cover, and individual
227 mound size varied between herbivore exclusion plots in 2014 and 2015. We created LMMs with
228 termite mound abundance and areal cover as response variables and the effects of cattle (2 levels:
229 present or absent; O, W, and MW plots vs. C, WC, and MWC plots), and wildlife (3 levels: no
230 wildlife (O and C plots), mesoherbivores only (W and WC plots), or megaherbivores and
231 mesoherbivores (MW and MWC plots)) as predictor variables. Block was included as a random
232 effect. We used a compound symmetry covariance structure to address the non-independence of
233 the two years of termite mound surveys within the same plots. Because we were interested in
234 potential differences in termite colony age and population size between herbivore treatments, we
235 also asked if herbivores affected the aboveground size of individual termite mounds, a proxy for

both age and population size (Darlington and Dransfield 1987; Josens and Soki 2010). We created a hierarchical LMM to test the effects of cattle and wildlife on the size of individual termite mound areas. Block and plot nested within block were treated as random variables. We again used a compound symmetry covariance structure to address the non-independence of the two years of termite mound surveys within the same plots.

In order to test the potential indirect feedbacks and mechanisms between large herbivores and termite mound abundance, we next asked whether large herbivores influenced the abundance of an important termite dietary resource, woody biomass (here measured as tree density). To model the effects of large herbivores on tree density, we created a LMM with cattle presence (2 levels: present or absent), mesoherbivore presence (2 levels: present or absent), and megaherbivore presence (2 levels: present or absent) as predictor variables. We included mesoherbivores and megaherbivores as separate predictor variables in this model because we were particularly interested in the quantifying the effects of megaherbivores on plot tree density. We also included the Northing centroid of each plot as a predictor variable to test and control for the previously-reported underlying N-S tree density gradient (Riginos and Grace 2008). Tree density from the central hectare of each KLEE plot was included as a response variable. Previous work in this system has already shown that ANPP and herbivore grazing intensity are strongly positively correlated (Charles et al. 2016). Grazing pressure is greatest in plots where cattle are present, and generally increases with the addition of each herbivore guild (i.e., grazing intensity in MWC > WC > C > MW > W > O).

Finally, we created a ‘termite dietary resources’ linear mixed model to test whether termite dietary resources affected termite mound abundance or areal cover. Our termite dietary resources models included termite mound abundance and areal cover as our response variables, and tree density and herbaceous ANPP as predictor variables. We included block as a random effect and used a compound symmetry covariance structure to address the non-independence of the two years of mound surveys within the same plots.

In TREE, we asked how termite mound abundance across the 60x60m treatment plots

varied with baseline tree density and responded to changes in tree density. Because plots were located on two directly adjacent ranches with different cattle densities, we included ranch identity as a random effect in all models. We first created a LMM that included baseline tree density as a predictor variable and 2006 termite mound abundance as a response variable. To test whether tree removal treatments predicted termite mound abundance after six years, we created a LMM with plot post-treatment tree density and the surround baseline tree density as predictor variables and 2014 mound abundance as a response variable. Ranch was included as a random effect.

Results

Termite mound patterns in KLEE

In KLEE, termite mound densities ranged from 2.75 to 8.25 mounds ha^{-1} , and their footprints comprised approximately 1-3% of the area of the experimental plots. Termite mound abundance was significantly affected by the presence of cattle; after accounting for differences in tree density, mounds were approximately 60% abundant in plots with cattle than in those without (C, WC, and MWC plots vs. O, W, and MW plots; $F_{1,29}=8.62$, $P=0.006$, $cR^2=0.43$; Table 1; Fig. 2). Although termite mound areal cover was also greater in cattle plots, this difference was not significant ($F_{1,29}=1.26$; $P=0.27$; Table 1). The presence of wildlife guilds (i.e. O and C plots with no wildlife; W and WC plots with mesoherbivore wildlife; and MW and MWC plots with both mesoherbivore and megaherbivore) were not significant predictors of termite mound abundance ($F_{2,29}=0.02$; $P=0.86$; Table 1) or areal cover ($F_{2,29}=0.39$, $P=0.68$; Table 1). It appears that the increased abundance of termite mounds in the cattle treatments of KLEE was due to an increased number of smaller mounds. The number of larger mounds was essentially unchanged between cattle and non-cattle plots (Fig. 3). The mean size of termite mounds in cattle plots was 56% less on average than plots without cattle ($F_{1,13}=14.65$, $P=0.002$; Table 1). Termite mound size was not significantly affected by mesoherbivore or megaherbivore wildlife treatments ($F_{2,13}=0.59$, $P=0.57$; Table 1).

Large herbivores significantly impacted the availability of termite dietary resources. By 2015, plots in KLEE which allowed megaherbivores contained 20% fewer trees across all blocks than those that excluded megaherbivores ($F_{1,11} = 5.34$, $P = 0.04$; Table 1). In contrast, neither cattle ($F_{1,11} = 0.13$, $P = 0.72$; Table 1) nor mesoherbivores ($F_{1,11} = 0.49$, $P = 0.48$; Table 1) were significant drivers of tree density. In addition, previous work in these plots has already show a strong positive correlation between grazing intensity and herbaceous ANPP (Charles et al. 2016).

We modeled the effects of termite dietary resource availability on termite mound abundance and areal cover. Termite mound density was positively correlated with tree density along the natural N-S gradient across KLEE ($F_{1,30} = 5.89$, $P = 0.02$; Fig. 4; Table 1). Termite density was also positively correlated with herbaceous ANPP among KLEE treatments ($F_{1,30} = 5.79$, $P = 0.02$). In contrast, termite mound areal cover was only marginally positively correlated with tree density ($F_{1,30} = 2.77$, $P = 0.11$), and not significantly correlated with herbaceous ANPP ($F_{1,30} = 0.02$, $P = 0.88$; Table 1).

Termite mound patterns in TREE

In the tree removal plots, mound abundance in 2014 ranged from 0-16.7 mound ha^{-1} . After controlling for differences in tree density, plots located on Jessel Ranch, which has higher cattle presence in our plots, had twice the density of termite mounds than the plots located on Mpala, which has had less cattle presence in the TREE plots since 2008 ($F_{1,21} = 10.14$, $P = 0.004$; Table 1). Our initial (baseline) 2006 survey of termite mound abundance showed that plots with the highest baseline tree densities had the highest initial termite mound abundances ($F_{1,22} = 7.81$, $P = 0.01$; Table 1). This accords with the positive effect of tree density on mound abundance we observed in KLEE. After controlling for this, we also found evidence for the impact of experimental tree removal on termite mound abundance. Post-treatment mound density was strongly positively correlated with post-treatment tree density ($F_{1,21} = 12.02$, $P = 0.002$; Fig. 4; Table 1) and surrounding baseline tree density ($F_{1,21} = 7.89$, $P = 0.01$).

Discussion

Our study provides unique descriptive and experimental evidence linking termite mound abundance to the availability of dietary resources. Further, we showed how two ecosystem engineers in this system, large mammalian herbivores and termites, are linked in previously unexplored ways (Fig. 5). Fungus-cultivating termites like those in our study are known to consume broad diets that include animal byproducts as well as woody and herbaceous plant material (Schuurman 2006; Freymann et al. 2007; Freymann et al. 2008). We demonstrate that changes in these termite dietary resources appear to drive and alter patterns in termite mound abundance, and that these resources can be modulated by the presence of large herbivore guilds. These findings suggest that large herbivores may be influencing termite abundance in ways that are simultaneously positive (e.g., stimulating herbaceous productivity) and negative (e.g., reductions in tree density), and that these effects can vary by herbivore guild. Our results also suggest that patterns of termite mound abundance are more dynamic than previously thought (Darlington 1985; Pomeroy 2005; Pringle and Tarnita 2017). Understanding and quantifying the diverse array of direct and indirect interactions between organisms will broaden our understanding of savanna networks.

Termite response to resource availability

Results from our herbivore exclusion experiment and tree removal experiment both tell a similar story: termite mound abundance (and, marginally, areal cover), is influenced by the availability of termite dietary resources. In KLEE, termite mound abundance was positively correlated with tree density and herbaceous ANPP. Meanwhile, termite mound areal cover was marginally positively correlated with tree density, but not herbaceous ANPP. The apparent explanation for the differences in our findings between termite mound abundance versus areal cover is the turnover rates of small colonies versus large colonies. Differences in mound abundance between KLEE plots appeared to be driven largely by the presence of smaller-sized mounds. Work in other systems has shown that smaller termite mounds tend to be occupied by newer colonies and experience higher turnover rates than larger mounds (Collins 1981). We would therefore expect to see dampened effects of biotic drivers on mound areal cover compared

to their effects on mound abundance.

We did not quantify the effects of an additional potential dietary resource, herbivore dung. Because herbaceous ANPP is strongly positively correlated with herbivore grazing intensity (Charles et al. 2016) and plot dung density, we were not able to disentangle the relative importance of herbaceous ANPP versus herbivore dung for termite diets. Previous studies have identified both dung and grass litter as important termite resources (Korb and Linsenmair 2001; Freymann et al. 2008), so it is possible that both resources positively contribute to overall termite abundance in this system.

Tree density was an important driver of termite mound abundance in both KLEE and TREE. We found a strong positive association between termite mound abundance and tree density along a natural gradient across the KLEE and TREE blocks. More powerfully, experimental data from TREE demonstrated a direct positive link between tree density and termite mound abundance. Together, these results provide evidence that termite colonies track changes in woody biomass availability, and that significant changes in mound abundance can occur over relatively short time periods (eight years in the case of TREE, and 20 years in the case of KLEE). While other studies have linked termite mound abundance and tree density (Davies et al. 2014), none have previously demonstrated this link experimentally. Results from TREE are also the first to demonstrate that termite colonies dynamically respond to changes in resource availability over relatively short time periods (10 years).

Our finding that tree density drives patterns in termite abundance is not surprising in the context of other functionally similar termite species. Many species of termites in the genus *Odontotermes* and the functionally comparable *Macrotermes* subsist on diets dominated by dead woody biomass (Donovan et al. 2001; Brune 2014). Plots with higher tree densities have more dead woody debris on the ground (Kimuyu et al. 2014). In addition, the amount of tree damage may be magnified in high tree density areas since elephants appear to browse more in these areas than areas with fewer trees (Riginos and Grace 2008) and typically pull down more woody biomass than they consume (Legendijk et al. 2016).

In both KLEE and TREE, there were strong pre-existing gradients in tree density. The biotic and abiotic conditions underlying this variation in tree density might also be important for our understanding of termite mound spatial dynamics. This tree density gradient appears to be the result of relatively small differences in soil texture (Riginos and Grace 2008). It is also possible that differences in soil could influence termite mound densities (hence the importance of our experimental approach). Soil and habitat type have been suggested as drivers of patterns in termite mound abundance in other systems (Korb and Linsenmair 2001; Davies et al. 2014). While it is possible that these soil differences could also influence termite mound abundance, results from the tree thinning experiment isolate tree density itself as a major driver of termite mound density.

Herbivores and termite resource availability

Our exclosure experiment revealed a range of pathways through which herbivores influence termite resource abundance. Importantly, we showed that termite mound abundance was linked to dietary resource availability, and that this resource availability could be altered by the presence of large herbivores. The influence of herbivores on termite dietary resources varied by guild and was not uniformly positive or negative. While megaherbivores had a significant negative impact on plot tree density, mesoherbivores and cattle did not. Meanwhile, herbaceous ANPP is strongly positively correlated with both overall grazing intensity and the presence of cattle, but not the presence of mesoherbivore or megaherbivore wildlife (Charles et al. 2016).

Overall, the abundance of termite mounds was strongly positively linked to the presence of cattle, but not significantly linked to the presence of mesoherbivore or megaherbivore wildlife. There are at least two pathways by which cattle may influence termite abundance, both due the influence of herbivores on termite resource availability. First, at the stocking rates in this site, cattle grazing stimulates aboveground herbaceous productivity (Charles et al. 2016), a termite food source (Boutton et al. 1983; Schuurman 2006; Freymann et

al. 2007). Second, cattle deposit considerable amounts of nitrogen-rich dung, another potential termite dietary resource. Unlike megaherbivores, cattle did not significantly influence tree density.

We did not find significant experimental effects of the presence of mesoherbivores or megaherbivores on termite mound abundance. While this is surprising in light of the strong positive effects that cattle have on mound abundance and size, it is possible that mesoherbivores and megaherbivores are impacting termite populations and resource availability in both positive and negative ways that at least partly offset each other. In contrast to cattle, wild herbivores tend to homogenize patterns in aboveground productivity in space and time (Charles et al. 2016); this homogenization may make termite resource acquisition and colony abundance more stable through time. Like cattle, mesoherbivores and megaherbivores also deposit significant amounts of dung, another potential termite dietary resource.

Megaherbivores reduced tree densities by 18% across KLEE plots. However, while megaherbivore browsing can reduce tree density, it can also simultaneously (and temporarily) increase tree damage and the availability of dead woody biomass (Holdo and McDowell 2004; Kerley et al. 2008; Pringle 2008). Therefore, a) there may have been as yet insufficient net effect of the reduction of tree density (18%) by megaherbivores on woody biomass availability to negatively impact termite populations, or b) it was being offset by their positive damaged woody debris effects.

Differences in abundance of termite mounds across herbivore treatments appeared to be driven by the formation of small termite mounds. This result may explain why the presence of cattle was a significant predictor of termite mound abundance, but not areal cover. In plots where cattle graze, smaller mounds are more abundant, whereas larger mounds are not. Small termite mounds like those found in plots with cattle are likely to be younger colonies (Collins 1981; Korb and Linsenmair 2001). The fact that few small termite mounds are found in non-cattle plots (Fig. 3) suggests that there are fewer new colonies being formed in these plots. The formation of new colonies may be in response to pulses of available resources such as aboveground

herbaceous cover or dung. Cattle are grazed in the KLEE plots episodically (as they have been traditionally throughout East Africa), providing pulses of dung and vegetative growth during those times. Previous work on the arrangement and density of termite mounds has focused exclusively on larger mounds (Pringle et al. 2010; Davies et al. 2014). Understanding the dynamics of both large and small mounds may give us a better understanding of termite colony dynamics and provide insight into our findings.

Positive and negative feedbacks between tree density and termite mound abundance

There is another feedback among these ecosystem engineers in need of further study. While overall termite mound abundance appears to be largely driven by woody biomass, *Odontotermes* mounds themselves are treeless. This may limit the total number of termite mounds in a landscape by reducing overall tree density and the productivity of existing mounds. However, it is not clear how termite mounds affect overall tree abundance in the landscape. These aspects of mound footprints comprise only 1-3% of the landscape in this system, so these feedback pathways may be relatively small, but nonetheless impactful.

Conclusions

We have demonstrated complex interactions among two types of powerful savanna ecosystem engineers: termites and large mammalian herbivores. These interactions are likely to alter larger-scale patterns of ecosystem structure and function. Our understanding of ecosystems and their engineers should not only include main effects, but also their interactions, which are likely to often be cryptic and best revealed by landscape scale multifactorial experiments such as those reported here. A particularly important takeaway of these surveys was the diversity of pathways through which termites and large herbivores interact. These pathways appear to have both positive and negative effects on termite mound abundance. Understanding how ecosystem engineers control the flow and availability of resources gives us a richer understanding of species interactions in savanna ecosystems.

Acknowledgements

449 This research was carried out under Government of Kenya research clearance permit No. NCST/
 450 RCD/12B/012/42. We would like to thank Frederick Erii, John Lochikuya, Mathew Namoni,
 451 Jackson Ekadeli, and Patrick Etelej for their invaluable assistance in the field. We also thank the
 452 Mpala Research Centre and its staff for their logistical support. The KLEE plots were built and
 453 maintained by grants from the James Smithson Fund of the Smithsonian Institution (to A.P.
 454 Smith), The National Geographic Society (Grants 4691-91 9106-12, and 9986-16), The National
 455 Science Foundation (LTREB DEB 97-07477, 03-16402, 08-16453, 12-56004, 12-56034, and 19-
 456 31224) and the African Elephant Program of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (98210-0-G563)
 457 (to T.P. Young, C. Riginos, and K.E. Veblen). Useful comments came from Elizabeth Forbes.
 458 Tree density plots set up with an NSF DDIG grant (DEB 06-07970) to C. Riginos.

459

460 **References**

- 461 Bartón K (2018) MuMIn: Multi-Model Inference. In: R Packag. version 1.40.4. [https://CRAN.R-](https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=MuMIn)
 462 [project.org/package=MuMIn](https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=MuMIn). Bates,.,
 463 Bonachela JA, Pringle RM, Sheffer E, et al (2015) Termite mounds can increase the robustness
 464 of dryland ecosystems to climatic change. *Sci* 347:651–655. doi: 10.1126/science.1261487
 465 Boogert NJ, Paterson DM, Laland KN (2006) The implications of niche construction and
 466 ecosystem engineering for conservation biology. *Bioscience* 56:570. doi: 10.1641/0006-
 467 3568(2006)56[570:TIONCA]2.0.CO;2
 468 Boutton TW, Arshad MA, Tieszen LL (1983) Stable isotope analysis of termite food habits in
 469 East African grasslands. *Oecologia* 59:1–6. doi: 10.1007/BF00388065
 470 Brody AK, Palmer TM, Fox-Dobbs K, Doak DF (2010) Termites, vertebrate herbivores, and the
 471 fruiting success of *Acacia drepanolobium*. *Ecology* 91:399–407. doi: 10.1890/09-0004.1
 472 Brune A (2014) Symbiotic digestion of lignocellulose in termite guts. *Nat Rev Microbiol*
 473 12:168–80. doi: 10.1038/nrmicro3182
 474 Charles GK, Porensky LM, Riginos C, et al (2016) Herbivore effects on productivity vary by

475 guild: cattle increase mean productivity while wildlife reduce variability. *Ecol Appl*
 476 27:143–155. doi: 10.1002/eap.1422
 477 Collins NM (1981) Populations, age structure and survivorship of colonies of *Macrotermes*
 478 *bellicosus* (Isoptera: Macrotermitinae). *J Anim Ecol* 50:293–311. doi: 10.2307/4046
 479 Crooks JA (2002) Characterizing ecosystem-level consequences of biological invasions: the role
 480 of ecosystem engineers. *Oikos* 97:153–166. doi: 10.1034/j.1600-0706.2002.970201.x
 481 Cuddington K, Wilson WG, Hastings A (2009) Ecosystem engineers: feedback and population
 482 dynamics. *Am Nat* 173:488–498. doi: 10.1086/597216
 483 Darlington JPEC (1985) Lenticular soil mounds in the Kenya highlands. *Oecologia* 66:116–121.
 484 doi: 10.1007/BF00378562
 485 Darlington JPEC, Dransfield RD (1987) Size relationships in nest populations and mound
 486 parameters in the termite *Macrotermes michaelsoni* in Kenya. *Insectes Soc* 34:165–180. doi:
 487 10.1007/BF02224082
 488 Davies AB, Levick SR, Asner GP, et al (2014) Spatial variability and abiotic determinants of
 489 termite mounds throughout a savanna catchment. *Ecography (Cop)* 37:852–862. doi:
 490 10.1111/ecog.00532
 491 De Beer Y, Kilian W, Versfeld W, Van Aarde RJJ (2006) Elephants and low rainfall alter woody
 492 vegetation in Etosha National Park, Namibia. *J Arid Environ* 64:412–421. doi:
 493 10.1016/j.jaridenv.2005.06.015
 494 Donovan SE, Eggleton P, Bignell DE (2001) Gut content analysis and a new feeding group
 495 classification of termites. *Ecol Entomol* 26:356–366. doi: 10.1046/j.1365-
 496 2311.2001.00342.x
 497 Eggleton P, Bignell DE, Hauser S, et al (2002) Termite diversity across an anthropogenic
 498 disturbance gradient in the humid forest zone of West Africa. *Agric Ecosyst Environ*
 499 90:189–202. doi: 10.1016/S0167-8809(01)00206-7
 500 Erens H, Boudin M, Mees F, et al (2015) The age of large termite mounds-radiocarbon dating of
 501 *Macrotermes falciger* mounds of the Miombo woodland of Katanga, DR Congo.

502 Palaeogeogr Palaeoclimatol Palaeoecol 435:265–271. doi: 10.1016/j.palaeo.2015.06.017
 503 Fox-Dobbs K, Doak DF, Brody AK, Palmer TM (2010) Termites create spatial structure and
 504 govern ecosystem function by affecting N₂ fixation in an East African savanna. Ecology
 505 91:1296–1307. doi: 10.1890/09-0653.1
 506 Freymann BP, Buitenwerf R, Desouza O, Oloff H (2008) The importance of termites (Isoptera)
 507 for the recycling of herbivore dung in tropical ecosystems: a review. Eur J Entomol
 508 105:165–173. doi: 10.14411/eje.2008.025
 509 Freymann BP, de Visser SN, Oloff H (2010) Spatial and temporal hotspots of termite-driven
 510 decomposition in the Serengeti. Ecography (Cop) 33:443–450. doi: 10.1111/j.1600-
 511 0587.2009.05960.x
 512 Freymann BP, Visser SN de V., Mayemba EP, Oloff H (2007) Termites of the genus
 513 Odontotermes are optionally keratophagous. Ecotropica 13:143–147.
 514 Goheen JR, Palmer TM, Charles GK, et al (2013) Piecewise disassembly of a large-herbivore
 515 community across a rainfall gradient: The UHURU experiment. PLoS One. doi:
 516 10.1371/journal.pone.0055192
 517 Goheen JR, Palmer TM, Keesing F, et al (2010) Large herbivores facilitate savanna tree
 518 establishment via diverse and indirect pathways. J Anim Ecol 79:372–382. doi:
 519 10.1111/j.1365-2656.2009.01644.x
 520 Grohmann C, Oldeland J, Stoyan D, Linsenmair KE (2010) Multi-scale pattern analysis of a
 521 mound-building termite species. Insectes Soc 57:477–486. doi: 10.1007/s00040-010-0107-0
 522 Gurney WSC, Lawton JH (1996) The population dynamics of ecosystem engineers. Oikos
 523 76:273–283. doi: 10.2307/3546200
 524 Hastings A, Byers JE, Crooks JA, et al (2007) Ecosystem engineering in space and time. Ecol
 525 Lett 10:153–164. doi: 10.1111/j.1461-0248.2006.00997.x
 526 Havery MI, Nutting WL, LaFage JP (1975) Density of colonies and spatial distribution of
 527 foraging territories of the desert subterranean termite, *Heterotermes aureus* (Snyder).
 528 Environ Entomol 4:105–109.

529 Holdo RM, Mcdowell LR (2004) Termite mounds as nutrient-rich food patches for elephants.
 530 *Biotropica* 36:231. doi: 10.1646/03025-Q1564

531 Jones CG, Lawton JH, Shachak M (1994) Organisms as ecosystem engineers. *Oikos* 69:373–
 532 386. doi: 10.2307/3545850

533 Jones CG, Lawton JH, Shachak M (1997) Positive and negative effects of organisms as physical
 534 ecosystem engineers. *Ecology* 78:1946–1957. doi: 10.1890/0012-
 535 9658(1997)078[1946:PANEOO]2.0.CO;2

536 Jones DT, Susilo FX, Bignell DE, et al (2003) Termite assemblage collapse along a land-use
 537 intensification gradient in lowland central Sumatra, Indonesia. *J Appl Ecol* 40:380–391. doi:
 538 10.1046/j.1365-2664.2003.00794.x

539 Jones JA (1990) Termites, soil fertility and carbon cycling in dry tropical Africa: a hypothesis. *J.*
 540 *Trop. Ecol.* 6:291–305.

541 Josens G, Soki K (2010) Relation between termite numbers and the size of their mounds.
 542 *Insectes Soc* 57:303–316. doi: 10.1007/s00040-010-0085-2

543 Joseph GS, Seymour CL, Cumming GS, et al (2014) Termite mounds increase functional
 544 diversity of woody plants in African savannas. *Ecosystems* 17:808–819. doi:
 545 10.1007/s10021-014-9761-9

546 Kerley GIH, Landman M, Kruger L, et al (2008) Effects of elephants on ecosystems and
 547 biodiversity. In: Scholes RJ, Mennell KG (eds) *Elephant Management: A Scientific*
 548 *Assessment for South Africa*. Witwatersrand University Press, Johannesburg, pp 146–205

549 Kimuyu DM, Sensenig RL, Riginos C, et al (2014) Native and domestic browsers and grazers
 550 reduce fuels, fire temperatures, and acacia ant mortality in an African savanna. *Ecol Appl*
 551 24:741–749. doi: 10.1890/13-1135.1

552 Korb J, Linsenmair KE (2001) The causes of spatial patterning of mounds of a fungus-
 553 cultivating termite: results from nearest-neighbour analysis and ecological studies.
 554 *Oecologia* 127:324–333. doi: 10.1007/s004420000597

555 Lagendijk DDG, Davies AB, Eggleton P, Slotow R (2016) No evidence for an elephant-termite

556 feedback loop in Sand Forest, South Africa. *Biol Conserv* 203:125–133. doi:
557 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2016.08.028>

558 Lagendijk G, Page BR, Slotow R (2012) Short-term effects of single species browsing release by
559 different-sized herbivores on sand forest vegetation community, South Africa. *Biotropica*
560 44:63–72. doi: 10.1111/j.1744-7429.2011.00776.x

561 Laws RM (1970) Elephants as agents of habitat and landscape change in East Africa. *Oikos*
562 21:1–15. doi: 10.2307/3543832

563 Lepage M, Abbadie L, Mariotti A (1993) Food habits of sympatric termite species (Isoptera,
564 Macrotermitinae) as determined by stable carbon isotope analysis in a Guinean savanna
565 (Lamto, Cote d'Ivoire). *J Trop Ecol* 9:303–311.

566 Levick SR, Asner GP, Kennedy-Bowdoin T, Knapp DE (2010) The spatial extent of termite
567 influences on herbivore browsing in an African savanna. *Biol Conserv* 143:2462–2467. doi:
568 10.1016/j.biocon.2010.06.012

569 Lundholm JT (2009) Plant species diversity and environmental heterogeneity: spatial scale and
570 competing hypotheses. *J Veg Sci* 20:377–391. doi: 10.1111/j.1654-1103.2009.05577.x

571 Mando A (1997) Effect of termites and mulch on the physical rehabilitation of structurally
572 crusted soils in the Sahel. *L Degrad Dev* 8:269–278. doi: 10.1002/(SICI)1099-
573 145X(199709)8:3<269::AID-LDR260>3.0.CO;2-8

574 Mando A, Stroosnijder L, Brussaard L (1996) Effects of termites on infiltration into crusted soil.
575 *Geoderma* 74:107–113. doi: 10.1016/S0016-7061(96)00058-4

576 Odadi WO, Karachi MK, Abdulrazak SA, Young TP (2011) African wild ungulates compete
577 with or facilitate cattle depending on season. *Science* (80-) 333:1753–1755. doi:
578 10.1126/science.1208468

579 Odadi WO, Young TP, Okeyo-Owuor JB (2007) Effects of wildlife on cattle diets in Laikipia
580 rangeland, Kenya. *Rangel Ecol Manag* 60:179–185. doi: 10.2111/05-044R3.1

581 Okullo P, Moe SR (2012) Termite activity, not grazing, is the main determinant of spatial
582 variation in savanna herbaceous vegetation. *J Ecol* 100:232–241. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-

2745.2011.01889.x

- Pinheiro J, Bates D, Debroy S, et al (2015) nlme: Linear and Nonlinear Mixed Effects Models.
- Pomeroy D (2005) Stability of termite mound populations in a variable environment. *J East African Nat Hist* 94:343–361. doi: 10.2982/0012-8317(2005)94
- Porensky LM, Veblen KE (2015) Generation of ecosystem hotspots using short-term cattle corrals in an African savanna. *Rangel Ecol Manag* 68:131–141. doi: 10.1016/j.rama.2015.01.002
- Pringle RM (2008) Elephants as agents of habitat creation for small vertebrates at the patch scale. *Ecology* 89:26–33. doi: 10.1890/07-0776.1
- Pringle RM, Doak DF, Brody AK, et al (2010) Spatial pattern enhances ecosystem functioning in an African savanna. *PLoS Biol* 8:e1000377. doi: 10.1371/journal.pbio.1000377
- Pringle RM, Goheen JR, Palmer TM, et al (2014) Low functional redundancy among mammalian browsers in regulating an encroaching shrub (*Solanum campylacanthum*) in African savannah.
- Pringle RM, Tarnita CE (2017) Spatial self-organization of ecosystems: integrating multiple mechanisms of regular-pattern formation. *Annu Rev Entomol* 62:?? doi: 10.1146/annurev-ento-031616-035413
- Riginos C (2014) Climate and the landscape of fear in an African savanna. *J Anim Ecol* 84:124–133. doi: 10.1111/1365-2656.12262
- Riginos C, Grace JB (2008) Savanna tree density, herbivores, and the herbaceous community: bottom-up vs. top-down effects. *Ecology* 89:2228–2238. doi: 10.1890/07-1250.1
- Riginos C, Young TP, Porensky LM, et al (2013) Herbivory and drought interact to enhance spatial patterning and diversity in a savanna understory. *Oecologia* 173:591–602. doi: 10.1007/s00442-013-2637-4
- Romero GQ, Gonçalves-Souza T, Vieira C, Koricheva J (2014) Ecosystem engineering effects on species diversity across ecosystems: a meta-analysis. *Biol Rev Camb Philos Soc* 90:877–890. doi: 10.1111/brv.12138

610 Schuurman G (2006) Termite diets in dry habitats of the Okavango delta region of northern
 611 Botswana: A stable carbon isotope analysis. *Sociobiology* 47:373–389.
 612 Seymour CL, Joseph GS, Makumbe M, et al (2016) Woody species composition in an African
 613 savanna: determined by centuries of termite activity but modulated by 50 years of ungulate
 614 herbivory. *J Veg Sci* 27:824–833. doi: 10.1111/jvs.12393
 615 Sileshi GW, Arshad MA, Konate S, Nkunika POY (2010) Termite-induced heterogeneity in
 616 African savanna vegetation: mechanisms and patterns. *J Veg Sci* 21:923–937. doi:
 617 10.1111/j.1654-1103.2010.01197.x
 618 Sitters J, Maechler M-J, Edwards PJ, et al (2014) Interactions between C : N : P stoichiometry
 619 and soil macrofauna control dung decomposition of savanna herbivores. *Funct Ecol* 28:776–
 620 786. doi: 10.1111/1365-2435.12213
 621 Sitters J, Olde Venterink H (2015) The need for a novel integrative theory on feedbacks between
 622 herbivores, plants and soil nutrient cycling. *Plant Soil* 396:421–426. doi: 10.1007/s11104-
 623 015-2679-y
 624 Sitters, J., D.M. Kimuyu, P. Claeys, T.P. Young & H. Olde Venterink. 2020. Megaherbivores
 625 reverse negative effects of cattle on soil carbon and nutrient pools. *Nature Sustainability*
 626 3:360–366.
 627 Stevens RD, Tello JS (2011) Diversity begets diversity: relative roles of structural and resource
 628 heterogeneity in determining rodent community structure. *J Mammal* 92:387–395. doi:
 629 10.1644/10-MAMM-A-117.1
 630 Tews J, Brose U, Grimm V, et al (2004) Animal species diversity driven by habitat
 631 heterogeneity/diversity: the importance of keystone structures. *J Biogeogr* 31:79–92. doi:
 632 10.1046/j.0305-0270.2003.00994.x
 633 Veblen KE (2012) Savanna glade hotspots: Plant community development and synergy with
 634 large herbivores. *J Arid Environ* 78:119–127. doi: 10.1016/j.jaridenv.2011.10.016
 635 Veblen KE, Porensky LM, Riginos C, Young TP (2016) Are cattle surrogate wildlife? Savanna
 636 plant community composition explained by total herbivory more than herbivore type. *Ecol*

Appl. doi: 10.1890/15-1367.1

- Whyte IJ, van Aarde RJ, Pimm SL (2003) Kruger's elephant population: Its size and consequences for ecosystem heterogeneity. In: du Toit JT, Rogers KH, Biggs HC (eds) *The Kruger Experience: Ecology and Management of Savanna Heterogeneity*. Island Press, Washington, D.C., pp 332–348
- Wood TJ (1978) Food and feeding habits of termites. In: Brian MV (ed) *Production Ecology of Ants and Termites*. Cambridge University Press, pp 55–80
- Wright JP (2009) Linking populations to landscapes: richness scenarios resulting from changes in the dynamics of an ecosystem engineer. *Ecology* 90:3418–3429. doi: 10.1890/08-1885.1
- Wright JP, Gurney WSC, Jones CG (2004) Patch dynamics in a landscape modified by ecosystem engineers. *Oikos* 105:336–348. doi: 10.1111/j.0030-1299.2004.12654.x
- Wright JP, Jones CG (2006) The Concept of Organisms as Ecosystem Engineers Ten Years On: Progress, Limitations, and Challenges. *Bioscience* 56:203.
- Young HS, Mccauley DJ, Helgen KM, et al (2013) Effects of mammalian herbivore declines on plant communities: Observations and experiments in an African savanna. *J Ecol* 101:1030–1041. doi: 10.1111/1365-2745.12096
- Young TP, Okello B, Kinyua D, Palmer TM (1998) KLEE: a long-term multi-species herbivore exclusion experiment in Laikipia, Kenya. *African J Range Forage Sci* 104:92–104. doi: 10.1080/10220119.1997.9647929

658 **Table Captions**

659 **Table 1.** Linear mixed model results for the relationships between herbivore treatments, termite
660 dietary resources, and termite mound abundance, areal cover, and size. Random effects for each
661 model are specified in the methods section. Bolded results are significant at the $P = 0.05$ level.

662

663 Figure Captions

664 **Fig. 1:** Map of the Kenya Long-term Exclosure Experiment (KLEE) and the Tree Removal
665 Ecosystem Experiment (TREE). In KLEE plots, letters represent the guilds of large herbivores
666 present in each experimental plot. O = No herbivores, C = Cattle, W = Wildlife >15kg, and M =
667 Megaherbivores. TREE plots to the west of the North-South boundary road are located on Jessel
668 Ranch. All other plots are located on Mpala Research Center property.

669 **Fig. 2:** Herbivore effects by guild on termite mound abundance per hectare in the KLEE plots.
670 Error bars represent one standard error. Termite mound abundance was significantly affected by
671 the presence of cattle, but not mesoherbivores or megaherbivores. For each graph, significant
672 differences ($P < 0.05$, Tukey's HSD) among herbivore treatments are indicated with letters. **A)**
673 Termite mound abundance in non-cattle (O, W, and MW) versus cattle (C, WC, and MWC)
674 plots. **B)** Termite mound abundance in non-wildlife plots (O and C) versus mesoherbivore
675 wildlife (W and WC) and megaherbivore wildlife (MW and MWC) plots.

676 **Fig. 3:** Histogram of termite mound size in KLEE plots where cattle are present (C, WC, and
677 MWC) or absent (O, W, and MW). Corresponding lines represent the kernel density estimate for
678 each distribution.

679 **Fig. 4:** Relationships between current tree density and termite mound abundance per hectare in
680 A) TREE plots after 8 years of treatment and B) KLEE plots after 20 years of treatment. Dotted
681 lines represent fitted linear relationships between variables. Tree density was a
682 significant predictor of termite mound abundance in both experiments.

683 **Fig. 5:** Hypothesized and demonstrated relationships between KLEE herbivore treatments,
684 shared termite-herbivore dietary resources, and termite mound abundance. Solid lines indicate
685 direct relationships while dotted lines indicate assumed indirect relationships between variables.
686 Red lines indicate a negative relationship between variables, green lines indicate a positive
687 relationship between variables, and gray lines indicate a non-significant relationship between
688 variables at the $P = 0.05$ level. For the relationship between different herbivore guilds and
689 herbaceous ANPP, the bolder green indicates a stronger relationship between cattle and

690 herbaceous ANPP than either mesoherbivore wildlife or megaherbivore wildlife (data taken from
691 Charles 2016). “Cattle” refers to the comparison between KLEE plots where cattle are present
692 (C, WC, and MWC) and plots where cattle are not present (O, W, and MW). Effects of
693 mesoherbivores (W and WC plots) and megaherbivores (MW and MWC plots) were compared
694 to each other and to KLEE plots without wildlife (O and C plots).

695 **Table 1.**
696 |

Experiment	Model	Response Variable	Predictor Variable (fixed)	DF	F	P	Mar
KLEE	Effects of herbivores on plot termite mound abundance	Termite mound abundance	Cattle presence	1	8.62	0.006	
			Wildlife guild presence	2	0.02	0.86	
KLEE	Effects of herbivores on plot termite mound areal cover	Termite mound areal cover	Cattle presence	1	1.26	0.27	
			Wildlife guild presence	2	0.39	0.68	
KLEE	Effects of herbivores on individual termite mound size	Individual termite mound size	Cattle presence	1	14.7	0.002	
			Wildlife guild presence	2	0.59	0.57	
KLEE	Effects of herbivores on termite dietary resources (tree density)	Tree density	Cattle presence	1	0.13	0.72	
			Mesoherbivore presence	1	0.49	0.48	
			Megaherbivore presence	1	5.34	0.04	
KLEE	Effect of termite dietary resources on termite mound abundance	Termite mound abundance	Herbaceous ANPP	1	5.79	0.02	
			Tree density	1	5.89	0.02	
KLEE	Effect of termite dietary resources on termite areal cover	Termite mound areal cover	Herbaceous ANPP	1	0.02	0.88	
			Tree density	1	2.77	0.11	
TREE	Effect of baseline tree density on termite mound abundance	Baseline termite mound abundance	Baseline tree density	1	7.81	0.01	
TREE	Effect of tree density treatments on termite mound abundance	Post-treatment termite mound abundance	Post-treatment tree density	1	12	0.002	
			Background tree density	1	7.89	0.01	

Fig. 1







Fig. 2




705 **Fig. 3**



706

707

708 Fig. 4




709

710

711

712

A. Hypothesized links between large mammalian herbivores and termites



B. Demonstrated links between large mammalian herbivores and termites

