

Native Bees as Key Pollinators of Açaí (*Euterpe oleracea*) in the Central Amazon

João Victor Ladislau

jbladislau@gmail.com

UFV: Universidade Federal de Vicosa <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8052-6437>

Juliana Hipólito

INMA: Instituto Nacional da Mata Atlantica

Eduardo Freitas Moreira

USP: Universidade de Sao Paulo

Thiago Mahlmann

INMA: Instituto Nacional da Mata Atlantica

Marcio Luiz de Oliveira

INPA: Instituto Nacional de Pesquisas da Amazonia

Cristiane Krug

Embrapa Amazonia Ocidental

Research Article

Keywords: Stingless bees, Pollination, Inflorescences, Native bees, *Euterpe oleracea*

Posted Date: January 12th, 2026

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-8367450/v1>

License: © ⓘ This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

[Read Full License](#)

Native Bees as Key Pollinators of Açaí (*Euterpe oleracea*) in the Central Amazon

João Victor Ladislau^{1,*}: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8052-6437>

Juliana Hipólito^{2,3}: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0721-3143>

Eduardo Freitas Moreira⁴: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7754-9585>

Thiago Mahlmann^{2,3}: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0381-6377>

Marcio Luiz de Oliveira^{5,6}: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3950-1086>

Cristiane Krug^{3,7}: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6516-8048>

1. Universidade Federal de Viçosa, Viçosa, Minas Gerais, Brasil.
2. Instituto Nacional da Mata Atlântica, Santa Teresa, Espírito Santo, Brasil.
3. National Institute of Science and Technology in Pollination: Knowledge, Conservation, and Sustainable Use of Pollinators (INCT INPol), Rio de Janeiro, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil.
4. Universidade de São Paulo, São Paulo, São Paulo, Brasil.
5. Instituto Nacional de Pesquisas da Amazônia, Manaus, Amazonas, Brasil.
6. Instituto Nacional de Biodiversidad, Quito, Ecuador.
7. Embrapa Amazônia Ocidental, Manaus, Amazonas, Brasil.

*Corresponding author: jbladislau@gmail.com

SECTION: Ecology, Behavior and Bionomics

ABSTRACT

The açaí (*Euterpe oleracea*) is a key economic resource in the Amazon region. Despite this, studies on its floral visitors in Amazonas state remains scarce, outdated, lack species identifications and inferences about their role as pollinators. This study aimed to identify the floral visitor community and potential pollinators of an açaí crop in the central Amazon. From August 2018 to May 2019, we monitored the visits on 14 pistillate and 11 staminate inflorescences from 20 plants and calculated two indices: relative importance and pollen-transport efficiency, to identify the main potential pollinators. We collected 1,656 insects from 111 species, mainly stingless bees (45.77%) and other native bees (33.32%). Ranking values identified *Trigona williana* Friese and *Partamona ferreirai* Pedro & Camargo as the principal contributors to pollen flow, followed by *Trigona dallatorreana* Friese and *Frieseomelitta trichocerata* Moure. This ranking method represents a key innovation of our study. Using these indices, we identify species contributing most to pollen flow while retaining information on the importance and efficiency of all taxa. Our findings reinforce the role of native bees in açaí pollination and provide potential target species for regional management.

KEYWORDS: Stingless bees; Pollination; Inflorescences; Native bees; *Euterpe oleracea*.

INTRODUCTION

In the Amazon region, several tree species that produce edible fruits rely on insects for cross-pollination (Klein et al. 2007; Paz et al. 2021), including açai (*Euterpe oleracea* Martius, 1824), a tropical perennial palm tree native to the Amazon floodplain, naturally found in the Brazilian states of Amapá, Pará, Maranhão, and Tocantins (Vaz and Nabout 2016; Marques et al. 2024; Teixeira et al. 2025). Which has recently become increasingly popular in the Brazilian market beyond the extractive states and recorded an increase in exports, playing a key role in the economy of the Amazon region (Silveira et al. 2023; Fonseca and Lima 2024; Pepper and Alves 2024). This popularization has been largely driven by the worldwide recognition of açai as a “superfood” due to its health benefits (Yamaguchi et al. 2015; Barbosa and Carvalho Junior 2022; Silva et al. 2023).

The species (*E. oleracea*) is the main palm cultivated in Brazil, dominating crops in non-endemic states in the southeast, northeast, and north regions, including the state of Amazonas, which in 2023 produced approximately 105,221 tons (equivalent to US\$ 40,184,048.83), despite the region having an endemic species (*E. precatoria* Martius, 1842) (D’Arace et al. 2019; IBGE 2025).

A wide variety of insect taxa have been recorded visiting açai flowers in eastern Amazonia (Campbell et al. 2018), however, many of these include sporadic, opportunistic, and scavenger species that use floral resources without necessarily touching the reproductive structures or visiting both sexual phases of the inflorescences (Milet-Pinheiro and Schlindwein 2008; Alves-dos-Santos et al. 2016). Knowing the diversity of floral visitors and effective pollinators is key to developing management strategies for native biodiversity (Garibaldi et al. 2020), a factor that has already been identified as one of the main challenges in açai production (Muto et al. 2020; Bezerra et al. 2020; Campbell et al. 2022).

There are few studies on the insect community associated with açai (*E. oleracea*) in the state of Amazonas, such as the survey conducted by Gama (2004). However, they are mostly outdated, conducted mainly in the early 2000s, and lack species identifications or inferences about the role of these visitors as pollinators.

Considering these points, the present study aimed to understand the community of floral-visitors insects associated with an açai (*Euterpe oleracea*) cultivation and identify potential pollinators of the crop in the central Amazon region. In particular, to learn about this community and infer its effectiveness as pollinators, we asked the following questions: (1) What are the main insect taxa visiting the inflorescences of *Euterpe oleracea* in a plantation in central Amazonia, and how are they distributed between the male and female flowering phases? (2) Which floral visitors exhibit the highest potential to act as pollinators based on their contribution to pollen transfer?

MATERIAL AND METHODS

Study area

The flower visitor community was sampled in a 13-hectare experimental açai crop located in Rio Preto da Eva, Amazonas state (2°13'S, 59°58'W) (Figure 1). All individuals observed were young, three-year-old plants, approximately 3 meters high, belonging to a monoculture area of BRS-Pará variety, a variety produced by the Brazilian Agricultural Research Corporation (Embrapa) for the production of açai fruits on non-flooded lands, characterized by small plants, early production, 3 years after planting, and first bunch at 112 centimeters high.




Figure 1. Location of the açai (*E. oleracea*) plantation, located on Highway BR 174, Km 960, branch ZF-6, Rio Preto da Eva, Amazonas, Brazil, prepared by: João Victor Ladislau.

The region is surrounded by native primary forest typical of non-flooded humid tropical environments, featuring a canopy that reaches 30–37 meters in height and an open understory with a high density of acaulescent palms (Henderson et al. 2019). The climate is humid tropical (type AM), with a mean annual temperature of 26.5 °C and rainy season between January and June, followed by a marked reduction in precipitation from July to September (Köppen 1936).

Flower visitor samplings

Sampling was carried out between August 2018 and May 2019. In the field, 20 plants were monitored, comprising 14 pistillate inflorescences, and 11 staminate inflorescences were monitored. Captures were performed actively, using an

entomological net. The insects were collected at the beginning and end of each observation period, repeating this procedure in three periods: 8:30–9:45 a.m., 10:15–11:30 a.m., and 2:00–3:15 p.m., covering the period of anthesis, dehiscence, and abscission of male flowers (Campbell et al. 2018), each inflorescence was monitored for 15 minutes, with 15-minute intervals between each observation.

The collected material was deposited individually in perforated Eppendorf-type microtubes (the holes in the caps allowed the ethyl acetate vapor to enter and kill the insects), stored in plastic bags, and preserved in freezers. The presence or absence of pollen on them was verified with the aid of a stereoscopic microscope. All specimens were mounted with No. 2 pins, dried in an oven at 40 °C for 72 hours, identified by specialists in the groups, and deposited in the invertebrate collection of the National Institute for Amazonian Research.

Data analysis

The interaction network, were used to visualize and quantify the structure of relationships between insect species and inflorescence phenophases, providing insights into interaction strength and specialization patterns, was characterized quantitatively (considering the abundance of each species as an indicator of the number of visits) and qualitatively (by the presence or absence of visiting species) using a weighted matrix. Rows represent insect species and columns represent inflorescence phenophases. The graphs were created using Gephi (0.9.2) and subsequently edited in Inkscape (1.4.2).

To estimate the importance and efficiency of floral visitor species as potential pollinators of the açai crop in the field studied, the following indices were proposed:

1. The relative importance of each species for pollen flow (*Imp*), equal to the number of individuals of species with pollen captured in pistillate inflorescences (*n_Ipf*) divided by the total number of individuals with pollen recorded in pistillate inflorescences, considering all visitor species (*n_pf*):

$$Imp = \frac{n_Ipf}{n_pf}$$

2. The efficiency of each species in pollen transport (*Eff*), equal to the number of individuals with pollen from species captured in pistillate inflorescences (*n_Ipf*) divided by the number of individuals with pollen from species captured in staminate inflorescences (*n_Ipm*):

$$Eff = \frac{n_Ipf}{n_Ipm}$$

From these indices, a ranking value (*R*) was calculated by multiplying the relative importance values by the efficiency of each species:

$$R = Imp * Eff$$

RESULTS

1,656 insects were collected from the inflorescences of açai (*E. oleracea*), belonging to 111 taxa, with emphasis on stingless bees (Hymenoptera: Apidae: Meliponini; 45.77%), other native bees (Apidae: Exomalopsini, Tapinotaspidini; Colletidae: Hylaeinae; Halictidae: Augochlorini, Halictini; 33.32%), beetles (Coleoptera; 7.06%), flies (Diptera; 6.34%), wasps (Vespidae: Epiponini, Polistini; 4.77%), and bugs (Heteroptera; 0.42%). 1,172 individuals of 73 species were collected in staminate inflorescences, compared to 484 of 82 species in pistillate inflorescences (Figure 2). Forty-four species were observed in both sexual phases (Table 1).




Figure 2. Sankey diagram summarizing floral visitation to staminate and pistillate inflorescences of *E. oleracea*. Left-side nodes (white) represent the seven visitor groups, and right-side nodes (gray) represent the two inflorescence phenophases.

The morning monitoring period was the period of greatest activity of the visitor's community in the crop. Both abundance and richness peaked between 10:00 and 11:00 a.m., when activity began to decline sharply. Despite the rapid decline in abundance, richness declined less sharply. Ninety-seven of the 111 species (81.8%) sampled were captured between 8:30 and 11:30 a.m.




Figure 3. Average abundance and richness of *Euterpe oleracea* floral visitors across three monitoring periods: 1st (8:30–9:45 a.m.), 2nd (10:15–11:30 a.m.), and 3rd (2:00–3:15 p.m.), each comprising 15-min intervals.

Pollen grains were found on the bodies of 42 of the 111 species (594 individuals, 35.6% of the total sampled) (Table 1). Twenty-nine of these species were recorded visiting both sexual phenophases of the açai inflorescences (figure 4). Fifteen had an abundance of 10 or more individuals with pollen on their bodies, with 11 of them also captured in pistillate inflorescences. bees were the only group represented by species with more than one individual carrying pollen. Other groups observed had only four species with pollen on their bodies, all with an abundance of two individuals or less (Table 2).




Figure 4. Interactions between floral visitor species and the açai inflorescences. Insect node size = total abundance of each species; inflorescence node size = combined abundance of all species collected on them. Link width = relative abundance of each species per inflorescence type. Green = insects with pollen, gray = without pollen, purple = inflorescences.

The ranking values (R) pointed to two species, *Trigona williana* Friese, 1900 and *Partamona ferreirai* Pedro & Camargo, 2003, among the potential pollinators of açai in the monitored cultivation as the main species contributing to pollen flow, since they combine higher values in an order of magnitude of both importance (Imp) and efficiency (Efi) compared to the other species. Two other species, *Trigona dallatorreana* Friese, 1900 and *Frieseomelitta trichocerata* Moure, 1990, had high importance and efficiency values, respectively. Other species also have individuals with pollen on

their bodies recorded in pistillate inflorescences, but with much lower importance and efficiency indices than the species already mentioned (Table 3).

DISCUSSION

Composition of the Floral Visitor Community

Previous studies on the community of floral visitors to palm trees of *E. oleracea* in plantations in the eastern Amazon have highlighted the importance of generalist (non-specialized) species in the pollen flow of this group (Bezerra et al. 2020). In the present study, we found the presence of several insect groups, including native solitary and eusocial bees, wasps, flies, beetles, and bugs visiting the inflorescences of *E. oleracea*. Our data suggest, under the circumstances and limitations defined in the present study, that native bees, represented here mainly by stingless bees, are a group of unquestionable importance in the pollen flow of açai in central Amazon.

Hymenoptera was the main group sampled, representing 86.17% of the total insects sampled, especially native bees of the Meliponini and Halictini tribes (represented mainly by the genera *Trigona* and *Habralictus*, respectively). These results are in line with the recent findings of Bezerra et al. (2020) in açai palm trees in the Belém-PA region, where 51% of the total insects sampled belonged predominantly to these groups. According to Barfod et al. (2003), bees are often found in species that allow for extensive pollen foraging. In açai, the abundant number of small flowers (on average 18,478 male and 4,857 female) grouped in dense inflorescences, with abundant resources and relatively large, easy-to-handle anthers, may be associated with the majority presence of these taxa in the study (Renteria et al. 2024).

Daily Variation in Visitor Activity

Visitor community activity was highest during the first observation intervals (8:30 to 11:30 a.m.). Hymenoptera was the richest and most abundant taxon in all three periods. These results agree with Bezerra et al. (2020), who observed not only the predominance of interactions in the early periods of the day, but also a significant decrease in the number of pollen grains collected after the beginning of the afternoon period in their studies. The volume of nectar and sugar concentration in pistillate flowers of *E. oleracea* peak around noon, declining as the hours pass (Venturieri et al. 2014), and these conditions are associated with the reduction in floral resources observed by Bezerra et al. (2020) and the specificity due to narrow temperature variations in some bee species (Lima et al. 2018), the main constituent group of our observations, may be related to the sharp decrease in abundance after 1:00 p.m. in our study.

Contribution of Taxa to Pollen Flow

Previous studies on pollination of the palm species of the genus *Euterpe* have already demonstrated the importance of various taxa in the pollen flow of the group (Marques-Souza et al. 1996; Wendt et al. 2011; Dorneles et al. 2013; Campbell et al. 2018, 2022; Bezerra et al. 2020; Zamudio et al. 2021). However, only native bees of the tribe Meliponini were

captured on pistillate inflorescences with pollen on their bodies in our study. Other native bees, especially the tribe Halictini (represented here mainly by two species of the genus *Habralictus*), were also captured in both sexual phases, but none of the individuals captured on pistillate inflorescences had pollen on their bodies. The other groups captured in the study have only one species each with pollen records, all equally captured only on staminate inflorescences.

Our data are like those of Venturieri (2015), with studies conducted on *E. oleracea* crops in the region of Igarapé-açu/Pará, with a majority presence of Hymenoptera recorded in the inflorescences of the monitored crop. Other authors had already assumed the effectiveness of bees, especially native species (often Meliponini) for *E. oleracea* pollination, considering them effective pollinators of the crop, with a smaller contribution from flies and beetles (Henderson et al. 2000; Venturieri et al. 2014; Maués et al. 2024). However, other studies have revealed the participation of several taxa in pollen flow in *E. oleracea* crops, including the Curculionidae family, associated with the pollination of tropical palms and considered by Campbell et al. (2018) to be the only group with direct positive effects on the fruiting rates of the species under the circumstances of his observations (Küchmeister et al. 1997; Listabarth 2001; Bezerra et al. 2020).

Most tropical palms are pollinated by specialist taxa, mainly beetles of the Curculionidae family (Souza et al. 2018). the group is associated with palms with inflorescences of numerous small flowers concentrated in clusters, usually with nocturnal anthesis and protogyny (female flowers opening first), since they carry out their reproductive processes within the inflorescences, taking advantage of the thermogenesis performed by numerous species of Arecaceae for the maturation of juveniles, with their larvae feeding on floral tissue and their adults on pollen (Listabarth 2001; De Medeiros et al. 2019). *E. oleracea*, however, have diurnal anthesis, are protandrous (male flowers open first), and have greater floral resources and sugar concentration in the morning (8:00–11:00), these factors are more aligned with the bees' period of activity, since beetles peak during the night (Küchmeister et al. 1997; Listabarth 2001; Venturieri et al. 2014), which may explain the predominance of Hymenoptera species in our study.

Bees of the tribe Halictini, represented here by two species of the genus *Habralictus*, accounted for 29.7% of our samples. This genus had previously been recorded on *E. oleracea* inflorescences in studies by Bezerra et al. (2020) and more recently by Paz et al. (2021). These bees are known for carrying large amounts of pollen on plumose bristles located on the ventral side of the thorax and coxae. The pollen stored here is not mixed with nectar and is thus easily deposited on stigmas during floral visits, making them excellent pollinators for many plants (Parker et al. 2015; Stavert et al. 2016; Russell et al. 2021). However, despite their high frequency in our study, no specimens with pollen on their bodies were captured on pistillate flowers, even though females of both species were frequently collected on pistillate inflorescences.

Potential Pollinators and Ranking

Results from the species ranking based on visitation frequency and pollen transport efficiency between inflorescence types highlighted two species, *T. williana* and *P. ferreirai*, as the most important contributors to pollen flow in the studied

crop, due to their high visitation frequency and high importance and efficiency values compared to other species. Two other species, *T. dallatorreana* and *F. trichocerata*, also ranked well. However, unlike the previously mentioned species, *T. dallatorreana* (the most abundant in the study) showed low pollen transport efficiency, as most pollen-carrying individuals were collected on staminate inflorescences. Meanwhile, *F. trichocerata*, despite its high efficiency values, was one of the least sampled species (only four individuals). Other species had much lower relative importance, frequency, and efficiency values compared to those already mentioned.

This ranking method is one of the key innovations of our study. By using these indices and overall positioning, we can identify the species that contribute most to the pollen flow of the target plant without visitation frequency masking the importance and efficiency of all species in pollen transport. For example, *F. trichocerata*, one of the least sampled species in our study, achieved a good ranking position because most captures occurred on pistillate inflorescences a result that could be obscured in more traditional analyses, such as ecological interaction networks, where it would be overshadowed by species like the two species of *Habralictus*, which did not appear in our ranking.

Previous studies, such as Villa-Galaviz et al. (2023), used a similar structure to estimate the importance of pollinators, combining quantitative metrics (pQ – pollen quantity) with qualitative ones (pF – pollen fidelity), based on the amount and fidelity of pollen transported by each species. In our study, direct palynological analyses were not feasible at the time of the study, which led to the adaptation of this approach to field parameters that reflect pollen transfer potential. Thus, the indices proposed here, relative importance (Imp) and efficiency (Eff), use the distribution of individuals with pollen in pistillate and staminate inflorescences as proxies for the quantitative and qualitative components of pollination, respectively. This formulation maintains the central statistical logic of integrating the two aspects of pollination performance, while offering a practical and objective way to estimate species contributions to pollen flow adjusted to the circumstances that made palynological analyses unfeasible during the study period.

Implications for Bee Management

Species of the genus *Frieseomelitta* have been recorded on *E. oleracea* inflorescences in the Amazon estuary (Campbell et al., 2018), but this study presents the first record of *F. trichocerata* contributing to açai pollen flow. *P. ferreirai* and *T. dallatorreana* were previously reported visiting *Euterpe precatoria* (Rech & Absy, 2011), however, to the best of our knowledge, this is the first record of these species visiting *E. oleracea*. *T. williana* has also been recorded visiting *E. oleracea* in previous studies (Marques-Souza et al. 1996), and was observed again in our study.

Studies on the impacts of stingless bee management in commercially important crops like açai (*E. oleracea*) have shown positive results in the eastern Amazon. Muto et al. (2020) recorded a 2.5-fold increase in fruit size and number per bunch after introducing colonies of *Scaptotrigona* aff. *postica*. Our results reinforce the importance of native bees as pollinators of tropical palm trees. They also provide a list of potential target species for management in the region, as

all the potential pollinators identified are bees of the Meliponini tribe, belonging to genera already managed on the Amazon, but comprising species not yet exploited in regional meliponiculture (Menezes et al. 2023; A.B.E.L.H.A. 2023).

Our findings highlight the crucial role of native bees as pollinators of *E. oleracea* in the central Amazon. Meliponini was the most influential group in pollen flow for this crop, particularly *T. williana*, *T. dallatorreana*, *F. trichocerata*, and *P. ferreirai*, identified as the main contributors due to their high frequency, importance, and efficiency in pollen transfer between inflorescences. Beyond advancing ecological knowledge, these results provide a practical basis for promoting sustainable management strategies that integrate the conservation of native stingless bees into açai production systems. Such approaches can enhance pollination services, improve fruit yields, and strengthen the long-term resilience and profitability of açai cultivation in Amazonas state.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank the Entomology Graduate Program of the National Institute for Amazonian Research (INPA), the Brazilian Agricultural Research Corporation (EMBRAPA), The Brazilian Federal Agency for Support and Evaluation of Graduate Education (CAPES), the National Council for Scientific and Technological Development (CNPq), and The State Funding Agency of Amazonas (FAPEAM) for support. The Drs. Alexandre Somavilla, David Nogueira (Hymenoptera), Matheus Bento (Coleoptera), and Matheus Soares (Diptera) for identifying the material, and the members of the Entomology Lab of EMBRAPA for their help with fieldwork. We are also grateful to Dr. Edson Barcelos for granting access to his property and açai plantation, which made this study possible. JVL thanks the CAPES for the fellowship funding. ML Oliveira thanks CNPq for the productivity grant (311016/2023-5). JH thanks The State Funding Agency of Espírito Santos (FAPES) for the productivity grant (2025-4FGCZ). CK and JH thanks INCT Pollination (CNPq/CAPES/FAPERJ Call 58/2022).

DECLARATIONS

ETHICAL APPROVAL: Not applicable.

FUNDING INFORMATION: We declare that this study was financed in part by The Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Nível Superior (CAPES) – Finance Code 001, the Posgrad project – Fundação de Amparo a Pesquisa do Estado do Amazonas (FAPEAM), and the project “Rede de Interações de abelhas com frutíferas do Norte e Nordeste (PoliNet)” (Code SEG 02.16.04.024.00.00) funded by the Empresa Brasileira de Pesquisa Agropecuária (EMBRAPA).

CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENT: The authors have no conflicts of interest to disclose.

AUTHORS CONTRIBUTION: JVBL: Conceptualization, sampling, analysis of data, and writing of the article; JH: Analysis of data and writing of the article; EFM: Analysis of data and writing of the article; TM: Species identification and writing of the article; MLO: Species identification and writing of the article; CK: Conceptualization, funding, sampling, and writing of the article.

REFERENCES

- Alves-dos-Santos I, Silva CI da, Pinheiro M, Kleinert AMP (2016) Quando um visitante floral é um polinizador? *Rodriguésia* 67:295–307. <https://doi.org/10.1590/2175-7860201667202>
- Barbosa JR, Carvalho Junior RN de (2022) Food sustainability trends - How to value the açaí production chain for the development of food inputs from its main bioactive ingredients? *Trends Food Sci Technol* 124:86–95. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tifs.2022.04.005>
- Barfod A, Burholt T, Borchsenius F (2003) Contrasting pollination modes in three species of *Licuala* (Arecaceae: Coryphoideae). *Telopea* 10:207–223. <https://doi.org/10.7751/telepea20035616>
- Bastian M, Heymann S, Jacomy M (2009) Gephi. *Proc Int AAAI Conf Web Soc Media* 3:361–362. <https://doi.org/10.1609/icwsm.v3i1.13937>
- Bezerra LA, Campbell AJ, Brito TF et al (2020) Pollen Loads of Flower Visitors to Açaí Palm (*Euterpe oleracea*) and Implications for Management of Pollination Services. *Neotrop Entomol* 49:482–490. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13744-020-00790-x>
- Bierregaard RO Jr, Lovejoy TE (1989) Effects of forest fragmentation on Amazonian understory bird communities. *Acta Amazon* 19:215–241. <https://doi.org/10.1590/1809-43921989191241>
- Caetano TSG, Franco JR, Oliveira VC de et al (2024) A importância das abelhas sem ferrão na polinização das culturas agrícolas no Brasil. *Rev Delos* 17:1964–1976. <https://doi.org/10.55905/rdelosv17.n61-126>
- Campbell AJ, Carvalheiro LG, Maués MM et al (2018) Anthropogenic disturbance of tropical forests threatens pollination services to açaí palm in the Amazon River delta. *J Appl Ecol* 55:1725–1736. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2664.13086>
- Campbell AJ, Lichtenberg EM, Carvalheiro LG et al (2022) High bee functional diversity buffers crop pollination services against Amazon deforestation. *Agric Ecosyst Environ* 326:107777. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2021.107777>
- Campbell AJ, Silva FD da S e, Maués MM et al (2023) Forest conservation maximises açaí palm pollination services and yield in the Brazilian Amazon. *J Appl Ecol* 60:1964–1976. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2664.14460>
- D'Arace LMB, Pinheiro KAO, Gomes JM et al (2019) Produção de açaí na região norte do Brasil. *Rev Ibero-Am Ciênc Ambient* 10:15–21. <https://doi.org/10.6008/CBPC2179-6858.2019.005.0002>
- De Medeiros BAS, Núñez-Avellaneda LA, Hernandez AM, Farrell BD (2019) Flower visitors of the licuri palm (*Syagrus coronata*): brood pollinators coexist with a diverse community of antagonists and mutualists. *Biol J Linn Soc* 126:666–687. <https://doi.org/10.1093/biolinnean/blz008>

- Dorneles LL, Zillikens A, Steiner J, Padilha MTS (2013) Biologia da polinização de *Euterpe edulis* Martius (Arecaceae) e associação com abelhas sociais (Apidae: Apini) em sistema agroflorestal na Ilha de Santa Catarina. *IHERINGIA* 68:47–57
- Fonseca RN, Lima T (2024) The Rising Financialization of Açaí in the Amazon: Evidence of an Ongoing Process. *Lat Am Perspect* 51:248–269. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0094582X241232414>
- Gama AMM (2004) Estudo comparativo da biologia reprodutiva de *Euterpe oleracea* Martius e *Euterpe precatoria* Martius (Arecaceae) na região de Manaus-AM. Dissertation, Universidade Federal do Amazonas
- Garibaldi LA, Requier F, Rollin O, Andersson GK (2017) Towards an integrated species and habitat management of crop pollination. *Curr Opin Insect Sci* 21:105–114. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cois.2017.05.016>
- Garibaldi LA, Sáez A, Aizen MA et al (2020) Crop pollination management needs flower-visitor monitoring and target values. *J Appl Ecol* 57:664–670. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2664.13574>
- Giannini TC, Cordeiro GD, Freitas BM et al (2015) The Dependence of Crops for Pollinators and the Economic Value of Pollination in Brazil. *J Econ Entomol* 108:849–857. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jee/tov093>
- Gould T, Harrington B, Hurst N, MenTaLguY (2003) Inkscape.
- Henderson A, Fischer B, Scariot A et al (2000) Flowering Phenology of a Palm Community in a Central Amazon Forest. *Brittonia* 52:149. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2666506>
- Henderson A, Galeano G, Bernal R (2019) Field Guide to the Palms of the Americas. Princeton University Press, Princeton. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9780691197708>
- IBGE (2025) Censo Agropecuário. Instituto Brasileiro de Geografia e Estatística. <https://www.ibge.gov.br/explica/producao-agropecuaria/acai-cultivo/br>
- ICMBio, A.B.E.L.H.A. (2023) Atlas da Meliponicultura no Brasil. Associação Brasileira de Estudos das Abelhas.
- Isaacs R, Williams N, Ellis J et al (2017) Integrated Crop Pollination: Combining strategies to ensure stable and sustainable yields of pollination-dependent crops. *Basic Appl Ecol* 22:44–60. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.baae.2017.07.003>
- Klein A-M, Vaissière BE, Cane JH et al (2007) Importance of pollinators in changing landscapes for world crops. *Proc R Soc B Biol Sci* 274:303–313. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2006.3721>
- Köppen WP (1936) Das geographische System der Klimate. In: Köppen W, Geiger R (eds) *Handbuch der Klimatologie*. Gebrüder Borntraeger, Berlin, pp 1–44
- Küchmeister H, Silberbauer-Gottsberger I, Gottsberger G (1997) Flowering, pollination, nectar standing crop, and nectaries of *Euterpe precatoria* (Arecaceae), an Amazonian rain forest palm. *Plant Syst Evol* 206:71–97. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00987942>

- Ladislau JVB (2022) Polinização do açaí na Amazônia: potenciais polinizadores do açaí-de-touceira (*Euterpe oleracea* Mart.) em cultivo convencional na Amazônia Central. Dissertation, Instituto Nacional de Pesquisas da Amazônia. <https://doi.org/10.61818/ted25018>
- Lima MV, Pascoal LAF, Saraiva EP et al (2018) Panorama do aumento da temperatura no planeta e os impactos sobre as abelhas. *Rev Cient Prod Anim* 20:71–76. <https://doi.org/10.5935/2176-4158/rcpa.v20n2p71-76>
- Listabarth C (2001) Palm pollination by bees, beetles and flies: Why pollinator taxonomy does not matter. The case of *Hyospathe elegans* (Arecaceae, Arecoideae, Areceae, Euterpeinae). *Plant Species Biol* 16:165–181. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1442-1984.2001.00061.x>
- Marques MJ, Bezerra C de S, Tomaz JS et al (2024) Prediction of geographic distribution and ecological niche modeling of açaí palm trees in the Amazon. *Pesqui Agropecu Trop* 54:e78108. <https://doi.org/10.1590/1983-40632024v5478108>
- Marques-Souza AC, Moura de OC, Nelson BW (1996) Pollen collected by *Trigona williana* (Hymenoptera: Apidae) in Central Amazonia. *Rev Biol Trop* 44:567–573
- Maués MM, Campbell AJ, Silva FD da S e et al (2024) Manejo e conservação de polinizadores como apoio à produção sustentável do açaizeiro no estuário amazônico. In: *A Ciência das Abelhas - Pesquisa e desenvolvimento sobre polinizadores e polinização*. A.B.E.L.H.A., São Paulo, pp 155–172
- Menezes C, Alves DA, Lucena DAA, Almeida EAB (2023) Abelhas sem ferrão relevantes para a meliponicultura no Brasil. A.B.E.L.H.A., São Paulo
- Milet-Pinheiro P, Schlindwein C (2008) Comunidade de abelhas (Hymenoptera, Apoidea) e plantas em uma área do Agreste pernambucano, Brasil. *Rev Bras Entomol* 52:625–636. <https://doi.org/10.1590/S0085-56262008000400014>
- Muto NA, Leite RO de S, Pereira DS et al (2020) Impact of the introduction of stingless bee colonies (*Scaptotrigona aff. postica*) on the productivity of açaí (*Euterpe oleracea*). *Rev Verde Agroecol Desenvol Sustent* 15:265–273. <https://doi.org/10.18378/rvads.v15i3.8404>
- Parker AJ, Tran JL, Ison JL et al (2015) Pollen packing affects the function of pollen on corbiculate bees but not non-corbiculate bees. *Arthropod Plant Interact* 9:197–203. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11829-015-9358-z>
- Paz FS, Pinto CE, de Brito RM et al (2021) Edible Fruit Plant Species in the Amazon Forest Rely Mostly on Bees and Beetles as Pollinators. *J Econ Entomol* 114:710–722. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jee/toaa284>
- Pepper LG, Alves LDFN (2024) Small-Scale Açaí in the Global Market: Adding Value to Ensure Sustained Income for Forest Farmers in the Amazon Estuary. In: Montagnini F (ed) *Integrating Landscapes: Agroforestry for Biodiversity Conservation and Food Sovereignty*. Springer, Cham, pp 389–413. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-54270-1_12

- Potts SG, Biesmeijer JC, Kremen C et al (2010) Global pollinator declines: trends, impacts and drivers. *Trends Ecol Evol* 25:345–353. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2010.01.007>
- Quezada-Euán JGG (2018) Stingless Bees of Mexico: The Biology, Management and Conservation of an Ancient Heritage. Springer, Cham. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-77785-6>
- Ramírez VM, Ayala R, González HD (2018) Crop Pollination by Stingless Bees. In: Vit P, Pedro SRM, Roubik DW (eds) Pot-Pollen in Stingless Bee Melittology. Springer, Cham, pp 139–153. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-61839-5_11
- Rech AR, Absy ML (2011) Pollen storages in nests of bees of the genera *Partamona*, *Scaura* and *Trigona* (Hymenoptera, Apidae). *Rev Bras Entomol* 55:361–372. <https://doi.org/10.1590/S0085-56262011005000026>
- Rentería JJB, Rentería EL, Copete JC (2024) Biología reproductiva de *Euterpe oleracea* Mart., palma con alto valor nutricional para las comunidades del Pacífico colombiano. *Rev Cienc* 27:e13395. <https://doi.org/10.25100/rc.v27i2.13395>
- Russell AL, Fethers AM, James EI, Ashman T-L (2021) Pollinator effectiveness is affected by intraindividual behavioral variation. *Oecologia* 197:189–200. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00442-021-05016-4>
- Silva MACN da, Wolff LAS, Borges KRA et al (2023) Açai (*Euterpe oleracea* Mart.) byproduct reduces tumor size and modulates inflammation in Ehrlich mice model. *J Funct Foods* 103:105474. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jff.2023.105474>
- Silveira JT da, Rosa APC da, Morais MG de et al (2023) An integrative review of Açai (*Euterpe oleracea* and *Euterpe precatoria*): Traditional uses, phytochemical composition, market trends, and emerging applications. *Food Res Int* 173:113304. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodres.2023.113304>
- Souza APS, Junior HB dos S, Pereira R do N, Jardim MAG (2018) Visitantes florais de palmeiras em Floresta Ombrófila Densa Aluvial na Amazônia Oriental. *Biota Amaz* 8:1–4. <https://doi.org/10.18561/2179-5746/biotaamazonia.v8n3p1-4>
- Stavert JR, Liñán-Cembrano G, Beggs JR et al (2016) Hairiness: the missing link between pollinators and pollination. *PeerJ* 4:e2779. <https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.2779>
- Teixeira B, Teixeira G, Darnet E et al (2025) A review of the genus *Euterpe*: botanical and genetic aspects of açai, the purple gold of the Amazon. *Bot J Linn Soc* 208:1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1093/botlinnean/boae060>
- Vaz ÚL, Nabout JC (2016) Using ecological niche models to predict the impact of global climate change on the geographical distribution and productivity of *Euterpe oleracea* Mart. (Arecaceae) in the Amazon. *Acta Bot Bras* 30:290–295. <https://doi.org/10.1590/0102-33062016abb0036>

- Venturieri GC, Souza MS de, Carvalho JEU de, Nogueira OL (2014) Plano de manejo para os polinizadores do açazeiro *Euterpe oleracea* (Arecaceae). In: Yamamoto M, Oliveira PE, Gaglianone MC (eds) Uso sustentável e restauração da diversidade dos polinizadores autóctones na agricultura e nos ecossistemas relacionados. FUNBIO, Rio de Janeiro, pp 97–130
- Venturieri GR (2015) Ecologia da polinização do açazeiro (*Euterpe oleracea*) com e sem a introdução de colônias da abelha urucu-amarela (*Melipona flavolineata*). Dissertation, Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina
- Viana BF, Coutinho JG da E, Garibaldi LA et al (2014) Stingless bees further improve apple pollination and production. *J Pollinat Ecol* 14:261–269. [https://doi.org/10.26786/1920-7603\(2014\)26](https://doi.org/10.26786/1920-7603(2014)26)
- Villa-Galaviz E, Cirtwill AR, Gibson R, Timberlake T, Roslin T, Memmott J (2023) What makes a good pollinator? Abundant and specialised insects with long flight periods transport the most strawberry pollen. *Ecological Solutions and Evidence* 4:e12253. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2688-8319.12253>
- Wendt T, da Cruz DD, Demuner VG et al (2011) An evaluation of the species boundaries of two putative taxonomic entities of *Euterpe* (Arecaceae) based on reproductive and morphological features. *Flora* 206:144–150. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.flora.2010.03.002>
- Yamaguchi KK de L, Pereira LFR, Lamarão CV et al (2015) Amazon acai: Chemistry and biological activities: A review. *Food Chem* 179:137–151. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodchem.2015.01.055>
- Zamudio F, Gatti MG, Hilgert NI, et al (2021) Insects or Wind? New findings on the pollination system of *Euterpe edulis* (Arecaceae). *Arthropod Plant Interact* 15:503–516. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11829-021-09836-2>

Table 1. Flower-visitors of *E. oleracea*, recorded from August 2018 to May 2019 in Rio Preto da Eva, Amazonas. N (Abundance), % (Percentage), Ip (Number of individuals with pollen on their bodies), Inf (Sexual phase of inflorescence), S (Staminate inflorescences), P (Pistillate inflorescences), B (Both).

Visitors	Visitors			Inflorescences
	N	%	Ip	Inf
Coleoptera				
Anthicidae				
Anthicidae sp.	3	0,2		B
Cantharidae				
Cantharidae cf. sp.	1	0,1		P
Chrysomelidae				
Chrysomelidae sp. 1	1	0,1		S
Chrysomelidae sp. 2	1	0,1		S
Chrysomelidae sp. 3	1	0,1		P
Chrysomelidae sp. 4	1	0,1		S
Galerucinae cf. sp. 1	2	0,1		S
Galerucinae cf. sp. 2	8	0,5		S
Galerucinae sp. 3	2	0,1		B
Coccinellidae				
Coccinellidae sp.	3	0,2		B
Curculionidae				
Curculionidae sp. 1	81	4,9		B
Curculionidae sp. 2	5	0,3		B

Curculionidae sp. 3	1	0,1		P
Curculionidae sp. 4	1	0,1		P
Curculionidae sp. 5	1	0,1		P
Histeridae				
Histeridae sp.	1	0,1		P
Mordellidae				
Mordellidae sp. 1	1	0,1		P
Mordellidae sp. 2	1	0,1		P
Nitidulidae				
Nitidulidae sp.	2	0,1	1	S
Hemiptera				
Hemiptera spp.	5	0,3	1	B
Scuteleridae				
Scuteleridae spp.	2	0,1		S
Hymenoptera				
Apidae				
Apini				
<i>Apis mellifera</i> Linnaeus, 1758	27	1,6	18	S
Exomalopsini				
<i>Exomalopsis minor</i> Schrottky, 1910	11	0,7	10	B
Meliponini				
<i>Camargoia camargoi</i> Moure, 1989	2	0,1	2	B
<i>Frieseomelitta trichocerata</i> Moure, 1990	16	1	4	B

<i>Melipona amazonica</i> Schulz, 1905	2	0,1	2	S
<i>Melipona flavolineata</i> Friese, 1900	2	0,1	2	S
<i>Melipona illustris</i> Schwarz, 1932	1	0,1	1	S
<i>Oxytrigona obscura</i> (Friese, 1900)	1	0,1		S
<i>Paratrigona euxanthospila</i> Camargo & Moure, 1994	9	0,5	7	B
<i>Paratrigona melanaspis</i> Camargo & Moure, 1994	4	0,2	2	B
<i>Partamona</i> sp.	1	0,1	1	S
<i>Partamona auripennis</i> Pedro & Camargo, 2003	21	1,3	16	B
<i>Partamona ferreirai</i> Pedro & Camargo, 2003	21	1,3	19	B
<i>Partamona mourei</i> Camargo, 1980	1	0,1	1	P
<i>Partamona pearsoni</i> (Schwarz, 1938)	2	0,1	2	P
<i>Partamona vicina</i> Camargo, 1980	13	0,8	5	B
<i>Plebeia</i> sp. 1	4	0,2	3	S
<i>Plebeia</i> sp. 2	1	0,1		S
<i>Plebeia</i> sp. 3	15	0,9	5	B
<i>Plebeia</i> sp. 4	2	0,1	1	B
<i>Ptilotrigona lurida</i> (Smith, 1854)	10	0,6	7	B
<i>Tetragona goettei</i> (Friese, 1900)	6	0,4	3	B
<i>Trigona</i> sp.	1	0,1		S
<i>Trigona</i> sp. nov. (Ribeiro in press)	17	1	10	B
<i>Trigona albipennis</i> Almeida, 1995	3	0,2	2	B

<i>Trigona amazonensis</i> (Ducke, 1916)	1	0,1		P
<i>Trigona cilipes</i> (Fabricius, 1804)	1	0,1		P
<i>Trigona compressa</i> Latreille, P. A. (1811)	2	0,1		P
<i>Trigona dallatorreana</i> Friese, 1900	508	31	328	B
<i>Trigona dimidiata</i> Smith, 1854	1	0,1		P
<i>Trigona guianae</i> Cockerell, 1910	6	0,4	4	B
<i>Trigona williana</i> Friese, 1900	83	5	56	B
<i>Trigonisca</i> sp.	1	0,1		S
Tapinotaspidini				
<i>Paratetrapedia basilaris</i> Aguiar & Melo, 2011	1	0,1		P
<i>Paratetrapedia connexa</i> (Vachal, 1909)	4	0,2	1	B
<i>Paratetrapedia duckei</i> (Friese, 1910)	5	0,3		B
Colletidae				
Hylaeinae				
<i>Hylaeus</i> sp.	1	0,1		P
Halictidae				
Augochlorini				
<i>Augochlora</i> sp. 1	3	0,2	1	S
<i>Augochlora</i> sp. 2	2	0,1	1	S
<i>Augochlora</i> sp. 3	1	0,1	1	S
<i>Augochloropsis</i> sp. 1	4	0,2	2	B
<i>Augochloropsis</i> sp. 2	8	0,5	6	S
<i>Augochloropsis</i> sp. 3	5	0,3	3	S

<i>Neocorynura</i> sp. 1	3	0,2	1	B
<i>Neocorynura</i> sp. 2	16	1	12	B
<i>Neocorynura</i> sp. 3	1	0,1		P
<i>Pereirapis semiaurata</i> (Spinola, 1851)	1	0,1		S
<i>Temnosoma</i> sp.	1	0,1		S
Halictini				
<i>Habralictus</i> sp. 1	202	12	24	B
<i>Habralictus</i> sp. 2	290	18	24	B
<i>Lasioglossum (Dialictus)</i> sp.	4	0,2	1	B
Vespidae				
Epiponini				
<i>Agelaia angulata</i> (Fabricius, 1804)	1	0,1		P
<i>Agelaia lobipleura</i> (Richards, 1978)	1	0,1		P
<i>Brachygastra scutellaris</i> (Fabricius, 1804)	1	0,1		P
<i>Clypearia sulcata</i> (de Saussure, 1853)	1	0,1		S
<i>Polybia</i> sp.	1	0,1		P
<i>Polybia bistrata</i> (Fabricius, 1804)	2	0,1		B
<i>Polybia liliacea</i> (Fabricius, 1804)	3	0,2		B
<i>Polybia occidentalis</i> (Olivier, 1792)	7	0,4		B
<i>Polybia procellosa dubitata</i> Ducke, 1910	1	0,1		S
<i>Polybia rejecta</i> (Fabricius, 1798)	8	0,5		B
<i>Polybia scutellaris</i> (Write, 1841)	1	0,1		P
<i>Protopolybia chartergoides</i> (Gribodo, 1892)	50	3	2	B

Polistini

<i>Polistes geminatus</i> Fox, 1898	1	0,1		P
<i>Polistes versicolor</i> (Olivier, 1791)	1	0,1		S

Diptera**Agromyzidae**

Agromyzidae sp.	1	0,1		P
-----------------	---	-----	--	---

Asilidae

Asilidae sp. 1	1	0,1		P
Asilidae sp. 2	1	0,1		P

Calliphoridae

Calliphoridae sp.	2	0,1		P
-------------------	---	-----	--	---

Chloropidae

Chloropidae sp.	36	2,2	1	B
-----------------	----	-----	---	---

Lonchaeidae

Lonchaeidae sp.	2	0,1		B
-----------------	---	-----	--	---

Phoridae

Phoridae sp.	3	0,2		P
--------------	---	-----	--	---

Sarcophagidae

Sarcophagidae sp. 1	4	0,2		B
Sarcophagidae sp. 2	4	0,2		P
Sarcophagidae sp. 3	1	0,1		P
Sarcophagidae sp. 4	1	0,1		P

Scatopsidae

Scatopsidae sp.	1	0,1		P
Sciaridae				
Sciaridae sp.	1	0,1		P
Syrphidae				
Syrphidae sp. 1	15	0,9	1	B
Syrphidae sp. 2	7	0,4		B
Syrphidae sp. 3	1	0,1		S
Syrphidae sp. 4	4	0,2		B
Syrphidae sp. 5	1	0,1		P
Tachinidae				
Tachinidae sp. 1	1	0,1		P
Tachinidae sp. 2	1	0,1		P
Tachinidae sp. 3	1	0,1		S
Tachinidae sp. 4	1	0,1		P
Tachinidae sp. 5	1	0,1		P
Tachinidae sp. 6	2	0,1		B
Ulidiidae				
Ulidiidae spp.	12	0,7		B
	1656	100	594	

Table 2. Most abundant floral visitors. N (Abundance), Ip (Number of individuals with pollen on their bodies), Ipf (Individuals with pollen in pistillate inflorescences), and Ipm (Individuals with pollen in staminate inflorescences).

Visitors	N	Ip	Ipp	Ips
<i>Trigona dallatorreana</i> Friese, 1900	508	328	29	299
<i>Habralictus</i> sp. 2	290	24	-	24
<i>Habralictus</i> sp. 1	202	24	-	24
<i>Trigona williana</i> Friese, 1900	83	56	40	16
<i>Protopolybia chartergoides</i> (Gribodo, 1892)	50	2	1	1
<i>Apis mellifera</i> Linnaeus, 1758	27	18	-	18
<i>Partamona auripennis</i> Pedro & Camargo, 2003	21	16	4	12
<i>Partamona ferreirai</i> Pedro & Camargo, 2003	21	19	15	4
<i>Trigona</i> sp. nov. (Ribeiro in press)	17	10	1	9
<i>Frieseomelitta trichocerata</i> Moure, 1990	16	4	3	1
<i>Neocorynura</i> sp. 2	16	12	3	9
<i>Plebeia</i> sp. 3	15	5	-	5
<i>Partamona vicina</i> Camargo, 1980	13	5	1	4
<i>Exomalopsis minor</i> Schrottky, 1910	11	10	1	9
<i>Ptilotrigona lurida</i> (Smith, 1854)	10	7	2	5
<i>Paratrigona euxanthospila</i> Camargo & Moure, 1994	9	7	2	5

Table 3. Potential pollinators captured in pistillate inflorescences of *E. oleracea*. Imp (relative importance of each group for the relevant pollination flow), Eff (efficiency of each species in pollen transport), and R (ranking).

Potential pollinators	Imp	Eff	R
<i>Trigona williana</i> Friese, 1900	0,367	2,5	0,9174
<i>Partamona ferreirai</i> Pedro & Camargo, 2003	0,138	3,8	0,5160
<i>Frieseomelitta trichocerata</i> Moure, 1990	0,028	3,0	0,0825
<i>Trigona dallatorreana</i> Friese, 1900	0,266	0,1	0,0258
<i>Trigona guianae</i> Cockerell, 1910	0,018	1,0	0,0183
<i>Partamona auripennis</i> Pedro & Camargo, 2003	0,037	0,3	0,0122
<i>Augochloropsis</i> sp. 1	0,009	1,0	0,0091
<i>Camargoia camargoi</i> Moure, 1989	0,009	1,0	0,0091

<i>Melipona flavolineata</i> Friese, 1900	0,009	1,0	0,0091
<i>Neocorynura</i> sp. 2	0,028	0,3	0,0091
<i>Paratrigona euxanthospila</i> Camargo & Moure, 1994	0,018	0,4	0,0073
<i>Ptilotrigona lurida</i> (Smith, 1854)	0,018	0,4	0,0073
<i>Partamona vicina</i> Camargo, 1980	0,009	0,3	0,0022
<i>Exomalopsis minor</i> Schrottky, 1910	0,009	0,1	0,0010
<i>Trigona</i> sp. nov. (Ribeiro in prep.)	0,009	0,1	0,0010
