

Vegetation determines butterfly diversity and composition across the Arabuko-Sokoke coastal forest in Kenya, a tropical biodiversity hotspot

Maria Fungomeli¹, Martin Wiemers², Lucia Calderini³, Alessandro Chiarucci³

1 Coastal Forests Conservation Unit, Centre for Biodiversity, National Museums of Kenya, P.O Box 596 Kilifi, Kenya

2 Senckenberg German Entomological Research Institute, Eberswalder Str. 90, 15374 Müncheberg, Germany

3 Biogeography and Macroecology Group, Department of Biological, Geological and Environmental Sciences, Alma Mater Studiorum – University of Bologna, via Irnerio 42, 40126 Bologna, Italy

<https://zoobank.org/7CF5CEB5-FD82-49CC-BD5A-357423248E9>

Corresponding author: Maria Fungomeli (fungomaria@yahoo.com)

Academic editor: Thomas Schmitt | Received 6 April 2025 | Accepted 31 October 2025 | Published 25 November 2025

Abstract

Community structures, including butterfly diversity, are shaped by both biotic and abiotic factors, with forest type exerting a significant influence. The Arabuko Sokoke Forest (ASF), the largest remaining coastal forest fragment in Kenya and East Africa, is rich in biodiversity and endemic species. Given its varied forest types, ASF provides a unique opportunity to examine how these differences affect butterfly community structure. This study aims to investigate how vegetation diversity and structure influence butterfly community structures and species richness within ASF. We conducted butterfly and woody plant surveys during the dry season across four distinct forest types in ASF: *Cynometra* forest, *Brachystegia* woodland, mixed forest and the forest edge. Butterfly populations were sampled using transects measuring 10 m × 100 m and woody plant species were surveyed along overlapping transects. A total of 6,050 butterfly individuals were recorded, representing 86 species across 38 genera and five families. The woody vegetation comprised 178 species, belonging to 78 genera and 34 families. Significant differences in butterfly species abundance were observed across the forest types, though no significant differences were found in species richness. Beta diversity analyses revealed consistently high community dissimilarity across all forest types, driven predominantly by balanced variation in species abundances rather than nestedness. *Brachystegia* forest exhibited the highest total beta diversity, while forest edge exhibited the lowest. This indicates that species turnover, rather than richness differences, is the primary mechanism structuring butterfly communities at the landscape scale in Arabuko Sokoke Forest. Butterfly species diversity showed a strong correlation with plant species diversity. Additionally, butterfly wingspan size varied significantly amongst forest types. Our findings underscore the crucial role of natural plant forest diversity in supporting butterfly diversity and highlight the synergistic functions of the mixed forest and *Brachystegia* forest as key habitats. There is need for conservation strategies that account for multiple dimensions of biodiversity. While mixed forest serves as a reservoir of high species richness and abundance, *Brachystegia* forest offers critical value through their contribution to beta diversity at the landscape level. These results highlight the fundamental importance of conservation efforts directed to protect high plant diversity and structural heterogeneity to provide a broad spectrum of ecological niches and habitat connectivity for butterflies. Such strategies will enhance butterfly diversity and contribute to effective conservation in fragmented forests and especially in Arabuko Sokoke Forest.

Key Words

Arabuko Sokoke Forest, butterfly diversity, community structure, forest edge, habitat connectivity, habitat quality, plant species, species co-occurrence, tropical forests

Introduction

Community structures are shaped by the interplay of biotic and abiotic factors, with forest type exerting a significant influence on butterfly diversity. Different forest types can significantly impact butterfly diversity through changes in microclimate, resource availability, plant diversity and vegetation structure (Schweitzer and Dey 2011). Butterflies are widely regarded as effective bioindicators of habitat quality and ecosystem health due to their sensitivity to environmental changes and close associations with host plants and microhabitats (Bouyer et al. 2007; Dobson 2012). Their community composition and species richness often reflect underlying patterns in vegetation diversity and structure, making them valuable for monitoring biodiversity responses to habitat variation.

Globally, an estimated 18,000 butterfly species have been documented, with approximately 3,600 species occurring in Africa and around 870 recorded in Kenya (Larsen 1991). The Arabuko-Sokoke Forest alone supports over 300 of Kenya's butterfly species, highlighting its significance as a global biodiversity hotspot (Ayiemba 1995; ASF Management Team 2002). It is estimated that, globally, approximately 90% of butterflies are found in tropical areas, but their ecological role is less studied than in temperate regions, which also applies to vegetation studies (Bonebrake et al. 2010; see Fungomeli et al. (2020b)).

Butterflies play a crucial role as a biogeographical and ecological indicator group for habitat fragmentation, anthropogenic disturbance and climate change effects (Larsen 1993; Heikkinen et al. 2009; Manzoor et al. 2013). Their life cycle highly depends on plants either for breeding (host plants) or food (nectar) and multiple other environmental factors (Collinge et al. 2003; Manzoor et al. 2013). They can serve as indicators for biodiversity in ecological studies due to their sensitivity to even minor changes in habitat conditions or disturbances (Lomov et al. 2006; Bouyer et al. 2007; Dobson 2012). In addition, butterflies play an essential ecological role as pollinators and herbivores (Courtney et al. 1982; Bonebrake et al. 2010; Rader et al. 2015). Herbivory has been valued as a mechanism that has promoted plant co-existence and diversity, while pollination has enhanced plants life, growth and diversity (Vail 1992; Coley and Barone 1996; Viola et al. 2010). Moreover, their association with particular forest types and host plants, the fluctuation in their richness and abundance according to seasonality and their pervasive presence on the territory makes them perfect study subjects for investigating and monitoring the conservation status of ecosystems (Lien 2007; Monastyrskii 2007; Habel et al. 2018). This co-existence and interplay between butterflies and plants offers a unique fundamental contribution to ecosystem functioning while presenting a huge potential in tropical forests biodiversity monitoring (Humpden and Nathan 2010).

Vegetation diversity enhances ecological complexity by increasing the availability of nectar sources, larval host plants and microclimatic niches (Vu et al. 2015). Structural

characteristics, such as canopy height, foliage density and vertical stratification, further influence microhabitats and resource accessibility, directly impacting butterfly foraging behaviour, oviposition and survival (Collinge et al. 2003). Consequently, areas with high vegetation heterogeneity are often associated with greater butterfly species richness and more stable community structures.

Despite this well-established relationship, the extent to which vegetation diversity and structure shape butterfly assemblages remains poorly documented in many tropical and subtropical ecosystems. This is more pronounced especially in East Africa, a region known for its ecological heterogeneity and high biodiversity. The Arabuko-Sokoke Forest (ASF) in coastal Kenya presents a unique opportunity to investigate these relationships, as it encompasses a mosaic of distinct forest types within a relatively compact landscape, enabling detailed comparisons of butterfly community assembly across environmental gradients. The forest hosts four butterfly species endemic to the forests of Kenya and Tanzania: *Acraea matuapa*, *Baliochila latimarginata*, *Baliochila stygia* and *Charaxes blanda*, 50 nationally and globally rare plant species, three rare endemic mammals and is home to 230 bird species, 15 of which are rare and endemic to the Kenyan coast (ASF Management Team 2002). The forest also plays a crucial role as a global eco-tourism site, while locally supporting survival of the forest adjacent indigenous people livelihoods who depend on the forest for butterfly farming, collecting medicinal plants and wood production.

Moreover, although ASF is rich in plant diversity and butterfly diversity, little is known about their interaction. Limited butterfly studies carried out in ASF have looked at the butterfly diversity across the forest and forest types or seasonality influence on butterfly diversity (Ayiemba 1995; Habel et al. 2018). However, to our knowledge, there is no study that has thoroughly investigated the influence of the plant species diversity on butterfly diversity in ASF. Moreover, the need to regularly assess and monitor its continued fragmentation and biodiversity is therefore fundamental for long-term conservation efforts (Azeria et al. 2007; MacFarlane et al. 2015; Habel et al. 2017; Busck-Lumholt and Treue 2018). In this study, we investigate the relationships between vegetation structure and butterfly community structure and species diversity within the Arabuko-Sokoke Forest (ASF). This was achieved through systematic sampling along 100-m transects across different forest types, conducted over a four-month period, incorporating a range of butterfly functional traits to enhance ecological interpretation.

In particular, we investigate: (i) how the dominant forest types influence butterfly species diversity, composition and abundance in ASF; (ii) how plant species diversity influence or correlate with butterfly diversity and composition and (iii) how butterfly wingspan traits vary across different forest types. We synthesise these results to better guide the conservation policy formulations for sustainable forest use and management of the forest, especially in the dry season when this study was conducted.

Materials and methods

Study area and forest types

The Arabuko Sokoke Forest (ASF) is the largest forest fragment remaining within the Kenyan coastal forests covering an area of 42,000 ha, the second being Shimba Hills Forest (25,300 ha; Fig. 1A; Burgess and Clarke (2000); Fungomeli et al. (2020a)). It is globally valued as a world biodiversity hotspot of the Eastern Arc and Coastal Forests of Kenya and Tanzania (Myers et al. 2000). ASF is a centre of endemism, hosting a conspicuous number of threatened and endangered species and recently declared a UNESCO Biosphere Reserve (UNESCO 2019). Anthropogenic pressure and biodiversity loss, together with climate change are heavily impacting tropical forests, such as the Arabuko Sokoke Forest in Kenya (Burgess and Clarke 2000; Newton and Echeverría 2014; FAO 2018; Fungomeli et al. 2025).

As a dry lowland coastal forest, ASF spreads between the cities of Kilifi in the south and Malindi in the north, positioned between 39°48'E and 40°00'E longitude and between 3°11'S and 3°29'S latitude (Fanshawe 1995; Muchiri et al. 2001). It lies on a flat coastal plain at sea level and the area is divided by a low escarpment which crosses the forest from south-west to north-east (Moomaw 1960; Fanshawe 1995).

The climate consists of rainy and dry seasons, with two rainfall seasons of long and short rains. The long rainy season occurs from April to July; short rains from October to December, while the dry season lasts from December to March and in August/September (Burgess

and Clarke 2000; Omenge 2002). The annual rainfall ranges from 600 to 1,000 mm, with rainfall decreasing from east to west within the Forest (Omenge 2002; Habel et al. 2017). Temperature ranges from monthly averages of 24 °C and 30 °C and humidity is about 60% annually (Burgess and Clarke 2000). Several water pools exist within the Forest during the rainy season with most drying out in the dry season and there are no rivers within the forest (Fungomeli et al. 2001; Kanga 2002; Muriithi and Kenyon 2002).

A defining characteristic of the Arabuko-Sokoke Forest is the presence of distinct vegetation types, usually referred to as forest types (Fig. 1B–E). These forest types are closely associated with the underlying soil characteristics. The area features two predominant soil types: light, white sandy soils and heavier, red clay soils (Fanshawe 1995; Muchiri et al. 2001). These contrasting soil conditions have significantly influenced the distribution and composition of the forest's vegetation communities. The four distinct forest types are the *Cynometra* forest, *Brachystegia* forest, Mixed forest and the forest edge (Fig. 1B–E).

Cynometra forest

The *Cynometra* forest, which occupies the western sector of the ASF, is the most extensive of the forest types, accounting for over 50% of the forest area (Fanshawe 1995). This zone is found predominantly on red clay soils and is characterised by a dense, low-statured canopy, composed mainly of *Cynometra*




Figure 1. A. Map of Arabuko Sokoke Forest, Kenya, showing the distribution of the 108 studied butterfly transects within the four forest types: *Brachystegia*, *Cynometra*, Mixed forest and Forest edge. B–E. The four forest types study sites within Arabuko Sokoke Forest, Kenya showing. B. *Cynometra* forest; C. *Brachystegia* forest; D. Mixed forest; E. Forest edge. Photo credits: Maria Fungomeli.

webberi, *Cynometra suhalensis* and *Manilkara sulcata*, with occasional emergents, such as *Euphorbia candelabrum* (Fig. 1). The undergrowth is sparse due to the closed canopy and low light penetration, creating a relatively stable microclimate with reduced temperature fluctuations and high humidity.

Brachystegia forest

Brachystegia forest is located centrally within the ASF, on the nutrient-poor, white sandy soils and covers approximately 18% of the forest (Fig. 1; Muchiri et al. 2001). It is dominated by *Brachystegia spiciformis*, characterised by an open canopy structure interspersed with grasses and shrubs, resulting in a more sunlit and drier environment than other forest types. The floristic composition is adapted to dry conditions and the habitat is important for butterfly species, reptiles and birds that depend on high light availability and open understoreys. Additionally, the openness of this zone creates microhabitats favourable for thermoregulation and basking, crucial for many invertebrate and herpetofauna species.

Mixed forest

The mixed forest type is located in the eastern part of the Forest, where it grows on grey sandy soils that retain more moisture than the white sands, but are lighter than the red clay soils. This forest type represents about 17% of the Reserve and is notable for its high plant species richness and vertical stratification (Fanshawe 1995; Muchiri et al. 2001; Arabuko Sokoke Management Team 2002). It is dominated by mixed plant species of *Azelia quanzensis*, *Hymenaea verrucosa*, *Newtonia hildebrandtii* and *Manilkara sansibarensis*.

Forest edge

The forest edge was selected along the transition from the mixed forest of the Arabuko-Sokoke Forest (ASF) to adjacent agricultural lands. This ecotone represents a gradual shift from intact forest ecosystems to human-modified landscapes and coastal habitats (Fig. 1; Muchiri et al. 2001). It is characterised by a heterogeneous mosaic of land uses, including subsistence farms, scattered shrubs and open grassy clearings. Structurally, it exhibits increased light penetration, higher temperature fluctuations and reduced canopy cover compared to the forest interior. These conditions create a distinctive microclimate that supports a unique assemblage of flora and fauna adapted to edge environments.

Data collection

Field sampling and data collection were conducted during the dry season months (January–April) of 2019 across the four forest types of ASF: *Cynometra* forest, *Brachystegia* woodland, mixed forest and forest edge

(Fig. 1). Butterflies were sampled by using a standard number of 27 transects within each vegetation type leading to a total of 108 transects. Each transect measured 10 m × 100 m. Butterflies were recorded in each transect by using a standard count technique performed by walking at slow constant pace for approximately 15 min. All butterfly species seen on both sides of the path were recorded. Each transect was surveyed once per day, every day, throughout the four-month dry season (January–April 2019), ensuring comprehensive and exhaustive species detection in accordance with established butterfly monitoring protocols (Pollard 1977; Pollard and Yates 1993).

Butterflies were identified and recorded at species level. Specimens that could not immediately be identified in the field were caught with a butterfly net and placed in numbered envelopes or photographed for further identification in the lab. Identification was carried out using the butterfly references for the area (Larsen 1991) and supported by taxonomic counter checks from published sources. All transects were geo-referenced, with details of date, hour of start and end.

Vegetation field sampling was performed by using 27 plots each measuring 10 m × 100 m (same used for butterfly transects hereafter referred to as plots) and internally subdivided into 20 subplots of 10 m × 5 m. Each vegetation plot corresponded to a butterfly transect. Within the plots and subplots, we identified and measured the height and diameter at breast height (DBH) for each individual woody plant species (trees, lianas and shrub) with DBH ≥ 5 cm. Plants with DBH < 5 cm, such as small shrubs, were identified in two subplots of each plot (see Fungomeli et al. 2020a, 2020b).

Butterfly traits: wingspan sizes

We compiled and obtained wingspan sizes for our sampled butterfly species from published data sources of Woodhall (2005), Woodhall (2020), Schmitt (*pers. comm*), Barcode of Life Data System database (<https://v3.boldsystems.org>) and from the collection of the Senckenberg German Entomological Institute, Müncheberg.

All butterflies encountered along the transects were classified according to their ecological traits and distribution. The larval diet of each species was determined, based on host plant use and categorised into one of three trophic breadth classes: (1) monophagous, restricted to a single host plant genus; (2) oligophagous, restricted to host plants within a single plant family; or (3) polyphagous, utilising host plants from multiple plant families. A further classification into endemic status was assigned to species according to Larsen (1996).

Data analysis

A community matrix was prepared for the butterfly species abundances and another matrix was prepared for the woody plant species across the forest types.

Butterfly species diversity

Butterfly species diversity was analysed in terms of species richness, Shannon index and Simpson index across forest types:

$$\text{Shannon Index: } H = \sum_{i=1}^k p_i \ln(p_i)$$

$$\text{Simpson Index: } D = 1 - \sum_{i=1}^k p_i^2$$

For both indices, k represents the total number of species, while p_i indicates the relative abundance of each species that is calculated as n_i/N (in which n_i indicates the number of individuals of the i -species and N indicates the number of individuals of all species within the transect).

Butterfly species richness and mean abundance distributions across forest types were visualised using box-plots. Mann-Whitney U test for pairwise comparisons was used to compare species richness and abundance amongst forest types. Additionally, rank-abundance curves were constructed for each forest type to illustrate patterns of species dominance and evenness (Whittaker 1965).

Rarefaction curves and species diversity estimation

To assess and compare species diversity across forest types, we employed sample coverage-based rarefaction and extrapolation within the Hill numbers framework (Chao et al. 2014). We analysed abundance data for each forest type using the `iNEXT()` function from the `iNEXT` package in R (Hsieh et al. 2016), specifying `datatype = "abundance"`. This function performs both interpolation (rarefaction) and extrapolation of diversity estimates, based on individual-based abundance data. Confidence intervals (95%) were derived using 1,000 bootstrap replicates. Following Chao et al. (2014), extrapolation was constrained to a maximum of twice the reference sample size to maintain estimate stability.

Correlation between butterfly and plant species diversity

We applied a symmetric Co-correspondence analysis (CoCA) to quantify relationships between the plant species community with the butterfly species community across the forest types. Co-correspondence analysis is useful for comparing biological communities where observations have been made at the same locations (Braak and Schaffers 2004). We did this by a weighted average of species abundance values for plant species and separately for butterfly species within each of the forest types. We used `'coca'` function of the `'cocorresp'` R package (Simpson 2009) to correlate the butterfly and plant communities using the `'symmetric'` method. All graph plotting was performed using R package `ggplot2` (Wickham 2016) and `ggrepel` (Slowikowski 2020).

Butterfly species composition

We square-root transformed butterfly community abundances prior to the analysis to reduce effects of dominant

species. Transformed community abundances were then used to generate a Bray-Curtis dissimilarity matrix (Bray and Curtis 1957). We tested for species composition differences in the butterfly community structure amongst forest types by an analysis of similarities (ANOSIM) using the `'anosim'` function of the `'vegan'` R package (Oksanen et al. 2020). We also tested for significant differences between forest types using the permutational analysis of variance (PERMANOVA), using the `'adonis'` function of the `'vegan'` R package. All tests were conducted using 999 permutations. Butterfly species contributing to similarities across forest types were determined using similarity percentages analysis (SIMPER). P -values were adjusted using the Benjamini-Hochberg test to control the false discovery rate. This approach was selected for its ability to limit type I errors, while retaining greater statistical power than more conservative methods, such as the Bonferroni correction.

Beta diversity partitioning

To assess whether variability in butterfly community composition differed amongst the four forest types (*Brachystegia*, *Cynometra*, mixed forest and forest edge), we performed a permutation test for homogeneity of multivariate dispersions (PERMDISP), based on Bray-Curtis dissimilarities using the `'betadisper'` function in the `vegan` R package. We then evaluated beta diversity amongst the four forest types. We quantified multi-site beta diversity using the abundance-based extension of the `'betapart'` framework (Baselga et al. 2017), implemented via the `'beta.multi.abund'` function in the R package `betapart` (v. 1.6). This method partitions Bray-Curtis dissimilarity into three components: (i) total beta diversity (β_{total}); (ii) balanced variation in abundance (β_{balanced}) and (iii) abundance gradients (β_{gradient}).

We also assessed spatial heterogeneity of community composition within forest types by testing homogeneity of multivariate dispersion. Bray-Curtis dissimilarities, calculated from species abundance data, were used to compute distances of individual plots to their respective group centroids using the `'betadisper'` function in the R package `vegan` (Oksanen et al. 2020). These distances reflect within-group variation in community composition. Differences in dispersion amongst forest types were tested using ANOVA, followed by Tukey's Honest Significant Difference (HSD) post-hoc tests.

Butterfly composition – NMDS

To visualise differences in butterfly species composition amongst forest types, we conducted a non-metric multidimensional scaling (NMDS) analysis, based on Bray-Curtis dissimilarities (Kruskal 1964). Prior to analysis, butterfly species abundance data were square-root transformed to reduce the influence of highly abundant species. NMDS was performed using the `'metaMDS'` function from the `vegan` package (Oksanen et al. 2020) in R (R Core Team 2020). This function conducts automatic data standardisation, multiple random starts and iteration

to ensure a stable and optimal ordination solution. Groupings by forest type were visualised using convex hulls.

Butterfly traits: wingspan sizes

Using Pearson correlation, we correlated butterfly wingspan sizes across forest types, by first correlating for total abundances in all forest types and then second within each vegetation type. Following confirmation of normality, pairwise t-tests were conducted to compare average wingspan sizes across different forest types. To account for multiple comparisons and control the false discovery rate, p-values were adjusted using the Benjamin-Hochberg test.

Results

We recorded a total of 6,050 butterfly individuals belonging to 86 species, 38 genera and five families across the four forest types of Arabuko Sokoke Forest (Appendix 1). The plant species survey resulted in a total of 178 plant species belonging to 78 genera and 34 families.

Butterfly species diversity

Butterfly species diversity was primarily dominated by the Nymphalidae family, which had the highest number of species, followed by Pieridae, Papilionidae, Lycaenidae and Hesperidae (Appendix 1). Analysis on the most abundant butterfly species revealed *Phalanta phalantha*, *Appias epaphia*, *Catopsilia florella*, *Hypolimnys misippus* and *Coeliades forestan*, as the most frequent across all forest types (Suppl. material 1: fig. S1). A strong positive correlation was observed between species richness and abundance across the forest types ($R^2 = 0.89$). The distribution of butterfly larval feeding habits showed oligophagous and polyphagous species being dominant in all forest types (Suppl. material 1: fig. S2).

Rarefaction curves and species diversity estimation

Rarefaction curves revealed the mixed forest exhibited the highest species richness, followed by *Brachystegia* forest, forest edge and *Cynometra* forests (Fig. 2). Rarefaction curves for all forest types approached

Table 1. The butterfly species diversity across forest types, showing cumulative species richness and abundance, Shannon index and Simpson index per vegetation type in Arabuko Sokoke Forest, Kenya.

Species diversity	<i>Brachystegia</i>	<i>Cynometra</i>	Forest edge	Mixed forest
Cumulative species richness	50	40	52	80
Cumulative species abundance	1022	1112	2141	1775
Shannon's H Index	2.38	2.58	2.87	2.66
Simpson's 1-D Index	0.9	0.9	0.93	0.91

asymptotes, indicating sufficient sampling and species richness capture, except in the *Brachystegia* forest, where the non-asymptotic curve suggests that further sampling may uncover additional species.

Butterfly species richness and abundances across forest types showed that the mixed forest had the highest cumulative species richness, followed by *Brachystegia* and forest edge, while *Cynometra* had the lowest value (Table 1). Average species richness and abundance per plot varied across forest types, with significantly higher abundance values observed at the forest edge and in mixed forest habitats (ANOVA, $P < 0.05$; Fig. 3). According to ANOVA, differences amongst species richness per transect were at the significance threshold amongst forest types ($P = 0.05$), while species abundances per transect were significantly different ($P = 0.001$; Fig. 3). Pairwise comparisons of butterfly abundance revealed significant differences between *Cynometra* forest and forest edge ($P = 0.001$), *Brachystegia* forest and forest edge ($P = 0.013$), as well as between *Brachystegia* forest and forest edge ($P = 0.001$; Fig. 3).

The diversity indices indicated relatively similar levels of butterfly diversity across vegetation types. Shannon index values ranged from 2.91 ± 0.40 at the forest edge to 2.82 ± 0.42 in the mixed forest, while the Simpson index values ranged from 0.93 ± 0.04 to 0.92 ± 0.03 .

Beta diversity partitioning

Multivariate dispersions revealed significant difference in multivariate dispersion across the four forest types ($F = 3.893$, $P = 0.007$). Therefore, variation in butterfly community composition may in part be influenced by differences in within-forest type heterogeneity. Multi-forest type beta diversity analysis (β) revealed consistently high total dissimilarity across forest types, with β_{total} values ranging from 0.885 to




Figure 2. Rarefaction curves showing species richness as a function of number of individuals across the sampled forest types of *Brachystegia*, *Cynometra*, Mixed forest and Forest edge in the Arabuko Sokoke forest, Kenya. Each solid line represents actual sampled species (interpolated), and the dashed-line represents extrapolated individuals (extrapolated). Shaded areas represent 95% confidence interval.




Figure 3. Boxplots showing butterfly species richness and abundances comparison across the four forest types of *Brachystegia*, *Cynometra*, Forest edge and Mixed forest in the Arabuko Sokoke Forest, Kenya. Forest type with different letter denotes statistical significant differences ($P < 0.01$).

0.910 (Table 2). The largest contribution to beta diversity came from balanced variation in species abundance (β_{balanced} : 0.803–0.837), indicating that community compositional differences were primarily driven by species turnover in abundance rather than nestedness (β_{gradient} : 0.067–0.096) (Table 2). *Brachystegia* forest exhibited the highest total beta diversity ($\beta_{\text{total}} = 0.910$), suggesting substantial heterogeneity in community composition across plots. Forest edge had the lowest β_{total} (0.885), while *Cynometra* and Mixed forests showed intermediate values (Table 2).

Spatial dispersion of community composition

Spatial heterogeneity within forest types, assessed via multivariate dispersion, varied significantly (Table 2). *Brachystegia* forest exhibited the highest dispersion

(mean distance = 0.45), indicating greater spatial variability in species composition. These results reflect substantial spatial heterogeneity in species abundances in *Brachystegia*. In contrast, forest edge had the lowest dispersion (median ~ 0.33), indicating more homogeneous community structure. Tukey HSD tests confirmed dispersion in *Brachystegia* was significantly greater than at forest edges ($P = 0.006$), while other pairwise comparisons were not statistically significant (Table 2). These results reflect that forest edge communities are more similar to each other, while *Brachystegia* forest is more ecologically diverse. Overall, beta diversity results indicate that abundance-based species turnover drives community differentiation across forest types, with *Brachystegia* forests supporting more spatially heterogeneous communities, while forest edges harbour more homogenised assemblages.

Correlation between butterfly and plant species diversity

Co-correspondence analysis (CoCA) revealed a strong correlation between the species composition of plants and butterflies across the forest types. The correlation coefficients for Axis 1 and Axis 2 between the butterfly and plant communities were 0.991 and 0.994, respectively. The eigenvalues for the first and second axes indicated the contribution of each axis to the total inertia, with values of 0.022 and 0.012, representing a variance of 57.3% and 32.6%, respectively. This resulted in a total explained variance of 89.9% (Fig. 4), highlighting a robust and highly significant correlation between the community matrices of plants and butterflies.

Butterfly species composition

The NMDS analysis of butterfly species composition across forest types revealed considerable overlap, with no clear separation observed amongst the different forest types, with *Cynometra* forest covering a wider NMDS space that overlaps *Brachystegia*, forest edge and mixed forest (Fig. 5, Table 2). Butterfly assemblages across different forest types showed substantial overlap, with many species occurring in more than one forest type within the ASF. A pairwise permutational multivariate analysis of variance (PERMANOVA) revealed statistically significant compositional differences in butterfly assem-

Table 2. Summary of beta diversity metrics across the four forest types, including abundance-based partitioning components of total beta diversity (β_{total}); balanced variation (β_{balanced}); and abundance gradient (β_{gradient}), as well as multivariate dispersion (measured by the mean distance to centroid. Tukey HSD post hoc tests were used for pairwise comparisons amongst forest types (n.s. = no significant difference).

Forest type	n(plots)	β_{total}	β_{balanced}	β_{gradient}	Mean dispersion (distance to centroid)	Significant difference (Tukey HSD)
<i>Brachystegia</i>	27	0.910	0.825	0.085	0.452	higher than forest edge ($P = 0.006$)
<i>Cynometra</i>	27	0.903	0.837	0.067	0.425	n.s. vs. other types
Mixed forest	27	0.903	0.807	0.096	0.418	n.s. vs. other types
Forest edge	27	0.885	0.803	0.083	0.364	Lower than <i>Brachystegia</i> ($P = 0.006$)

blages amongst the forest types ($R^2 = 0.07$; $P = 0.006$). Additionally, SIMPER results show species composition differences amongst forest types that contribute up to 70% of the observed dissimilarities (Appendix 2).

Butterfly traits: wingspan sizes

Average wingspan sizes were significantly larger at the forest edge compared to the *Cynometra* forest ($P < 0.01$; Fig. 6). However, no significant correlation was found between wingspan size and species abundance across forest types (Fig. 7).

Butterfly traits: larval feeding habits

The majority of larvae from the species encountered were classified as oligophagous, followed by polyphagous species and a smaller number classified as monophagous

(Suppl. material 1: fig. S2). Overall, Oligophagous species constituted the largest share of individuals across all forest types, accounting for 63.4% of butterflies at the forest edge and reaching up to 67.5% in the mixed forest (Suppl. material 1: fig. S2).

Discussion

This study investigated the influence of vegetation diversity and structural complexity on butterfly community composition and species richness within Arabuko Sokoke Forest (ASF), a coastal biodiversity hotspot in East Africa. Our results provide new insights into butterfly community composition across habitat types within the Arabuko Sokoke Forest and their associations with plant communities. By examining species distributions alongside vegetation data, we highlight both broad and fine-scale patterns relevant to biodiversity conservation in tropical forest mosaics.




Figure 7. Butterfly wingspan sizes correlation across the four forest types of Arabuko Sokoke Forest, Kenya. Showing wingspan correlation for (a) The total correlation in the four forest types (b) the correlation for each forest type of *Brachystegia*, *Cynometra*, Mixed forest and Forest edge.

Butterfly community structure and habitat overlap

Butterfly assemblages across different forest types showed substantial overlap, with many species occurring in more than one forest type within the Arabuko Sokoke Forest. This pattern of overlap suggests a degree of functional connectivity between habitats, where butterflies may move freely across forest types for resource availability, to access nectar sources, host plants or suitable microclimates for thermoregulation and breeding (Aguirre-Gutiérrez et al. 2017). Such overlap is ecologically significant, as it implies that, while habitat types may differ in structure and floristic composition, they are not functioning as isolated ecological units for butterflies. Rather, these habitats may form a complementary mosaic that supports butterfly movement and persistence. This could be particularly important in fragmented landscapes, where connectivity between habitat patches is critical for maintaining viable populations.

As our study was limited to a single dry season, we acknowledge that seasonal variation could play a significant role in shaping butterfly community structure in ways that our data do not currently capture. A study by Habel et al. (2018) in ASF found that butterfly communities showed reduced community overlap amongst habitats during the rainy season. This discrepancy may reflect seasonal shifts in resource availability and changed microclimatic conditions. For instance, increased vegetation growth during the wet season may alter habitat structure, increase flowering plants and fruits for both nectar and fruit feeders and accessibility of host plants, leading to more specialised or stratified butterfly distributions (Castor and Espinosa 2015). In addition, species with narrower ecological requirements might emerge or become more dominant during the rainy season, thereby reducing the community-level overlap. Long-term or seasonally repeated surveys would be essential to determine how stable these patterns are over time and to what extent butterfly habitat associations fluctuate in response to environmental seasonality. Incorporating a temporal dimension into future studies could also help disentangle the relative importance of spatial versus seasonal drivers of diversity and overlap in tropical butterfly communities.

Relationship between plant and butterfly patterns

Our findings revealed a strong positive correlation between plant community composition and both butterfly diversity and assemblage structure across distinct forest types. This underscores the critical role of floristic diversity and vegetation architecture in shaping insect communities and confirms a fundamental ecological relationship between butterflies and the plants that comprise their habitats (Larsen 1991). This finding points to the foundational role that vegetation plays in structuring butterfly communities. Given that butterflies are closely tied to their host plants for larval development and to nectar-bearing and fruiting plants for adult foraging, this floristic diversity strongly predicts butterfly richness and composition. Importantly, what is the strength and clarity of this correlation within

a relatively small spatial scale and across naturally occurring forest types within ASF is noteworthy. Such robust cross-taxa associations are rarely reported in ecological studies conducted in the Tropics, where insect diversity often responds to a complex interplay of biotic and abiotic factors (Checa et al. 2014). In many systems, insect-plant relationships are masked by noise from microclimatic variability, dispersal dynamics or seasonal shifts (Checa et al. 2014). Our results, however, suggest that in Arabuko Sokoke, vegetation composition acts as a strong and consistent environmental filter, shaping butterfly assemblages in a predictable way. This reinforces the importance of plant diversity not only as a foundation for ecosystem structure, but also as a practical proxy for broader biodiversity patterns with significant implications for conservation planning and biodiversity monitoring.

Butterfly diversity patterns

Butterfly species richness and abundance varied notably across forest types. The mixed forest exhibited the highest cumulative species richness, followed by the forest edge and *Brachystegia* forest, while *Cynometra* forest supported the lowest species richness and abundance. Butterflies, as herbivorous insects, often exhibit narrow larval host plant specificity and selective adult nectar preferences, making them highly responsive to changes in plant community composition. This strong trophic linkage means that variation in plant diversity and abundance directly affects butterfly community structure. As previously observed by Larsen (1991), different butterfly species display distinct preferences for larval host and less for nectar plants, particularly during breeding and foraging periods. In ASF, the high plant species richness likely supports a broad range of butterfly guilds, contributing to the overall high butterfly diversity observed in the region. Moreover, our findings are consistent with broader ecological theory, which hypothesise that plant-insect interactions are mediated not only through direct resource relationships, but also via indirect mechanisms, such as vegetation structure and associated microclimatic conditions (Steffan-Dewenter and Tschamtkke 1997; Aguirre-Gutiérrez et al. 2017; Oliveira et al. 2021). Thus, structurally diverse vegetation can buffer environmental extremes and provide varied microhabitats, enhancing survivability and niche partitioning amongst butterfly species.

The significance of these findings is particularly notable in the East African context, where community-level studies examining cross-trophic linkages remain limited. The novelty of this study lies not only in the strength of the observed plant-butterfly correlation, but also in the implication that butterfly assemblages could serve as sensitive bioindicators of plant community composition and forest integrity. Given their rapid response to habitat changes, butterflies offer a valuable, cost-effective means for monitoring ecological health, particularly in data-deficient tropical regions, such as ASF. In light of increasing anthropogenic pressures on East African forest ecosystems, including habitat fragmentation, selective logging and land-

use conversion, our results emphasise the need to conserve floristically rich and structurally complex vegetation to maintain both plant and insect biodiversity. Integrating butterfly monitoring into conservation planning could enhance early detection of ecosystem degradation and provide information for adaptive management strategies.

The role of forest types

This study highlights differences in butterfly community structure across forest types, emphasising the distinct ecological contributions of each habitat to local and landscape-scale diversity. Butterfly abundance varied significantly amongst the different forest types, while species richness did not show significant difference. Beta diversity analyses revealed consistently high community dissimilarity across all forest types, driven predominantly by balanced variation in species abundances rather than nestedness. Consequently, species turnover, rather than richness differences, is the primary mechanism structuring butterfly communities at the landscape scale in ASF. Notably, the highest species abundance was recorded at the forest edge; however, they also exhibited reduced species turnover and lower community dispersion. The mixed forest supported the highest cumulative species richness, while *Brachystegia* forests, despite lower local species richness and abundance, contributed most to beta diversity and spatial heterogeneity. The high species turnover observed suggests that *Brachystegia* forest maintains a diverse and spatially variable butterfly community, potentially driven by microhabitat differences or floristic specialisation (Legendre et al. 2005). Overall, abundance-based species turnover is a key driver of butterfly community differentiation across forest types, highlighting the conservation value of structurally complex and spatially heterogeneous habitats like *Brachystegia* forest.

High species abundance at the forest edge can be explained by the possible presence of microhabitat niches of biotic and abiotic resources that support the availability of food and flowering plants for nectar feeding, especially during the dry season when most forest vegetation is not flowering. This pattern is largely attributed to the ecological blending of habitat types at forest edges, where forest edges often support both forest-dependent species and species adapted to open or semi-open environments. In addition, forest edges are typically associated with increased levels of disturbance, including greater exposure to light, wind and human activity, which can significantly alter habitat structure and microclimatic conditions (Habel et al. 2025). In ASF, this trend is evident across the forest types surveyed. Forest-interior specialists, such as *Euxanthethe wakefieldi*, *Amauris niavius* and *Amauris ochlea*, were predominantly observed within the mixed forest interior, where micro-climatic stability and specialised host plants are more likely to be present. In contrast, habitat generalists like *Hypolimnas misippus*, *Phalanta phalantha* and *Catopsilia florella*, which tolerate a wider range of ecological niches and host plants, were more frequently recorded

at forest edges. As a result, overall species abundance may be elevated in edge habitats, not due to the presence of rare or conservation-priority taxa, but because of the additional contribution of widespread, disturbance-tolerant generalists (Blair and Launer 1997; Bobo et al. 2006).

Moreover, forest edges host a synergy of cultivation around the forest edge, where agricultural activities promote herbaceous species that cannot be found in the forest during the dry season (Habel et al. 2025). These herbaceous plants provide a variety of flowers for butterflies to feed on during the dry season (Bonebrake et al. 2010). This characteristic makes the forest edge a place mainly devoted to feeding, while other vegetation habitats may be preferred for reproduction and oviposition. Consequently, relying solely on species richness or overall diversity as a metric for conservation planning can be misleading. High diversity in edge or disturbed habitats may mask the loss or decline of forest specialists, whose presence is a more accurate indicator of ecological integrity and long-term ecosystem health. Thus, assessing conservation value requires a species-specific approach that prioritises the occurrence, abundance and habitat fidelity of specialist taxa, particularly those confined to forest interiors.

In addition, the mixed forest within ASF appears to maintain relatively moist and stable microclimatic conditions, owing to its tall canopy cover, sub-canopy layers, variable understorey and favourable soil characteristics (Fanshawe 1995; Muchiri et al. 2001). These environmental conditions create a wide range of ecological niches which supports several shade-dependent species, including forest-dependent butterflies, likely contributing to its ability to support a higher diversity of butterfly species. Notably, *Papilio dardanus*, a species typically more abundant during the rainy season, was recorded exclusively in the mixed and *Brachystegia* forest types during this survey, i.e. during the dry season. This unusual seasonal presence suggests that the mixed forest offers sufficiently favourable microhabitats to buffer against seasonal fluctuations in temperature and humidity. A seasonality study by Habel et al. (2018) reported higher butterfly species richness in ASF during the rainy season, highlighting the influence of seasonal conditions, particularly rainfall on butterfly richness. Supporting the occurrence of *P. dardanus*, the plant survey revealed a high abundance of its known host plants, particularly *Clausena anisata*, *Vepris amaniensis* and *Vepris trichocarpa*, within the mixed forest (Fungomeli et al. 2020a, 2020b). The availability of these larval host plants, combined with shaded, humid microclimates, likely creates optimal conditions for the survival and reproduction of *P. dardanus*.

Furthermore, the mixed forest is a preferred habitat for elephants, likely due to its food resources and canopy shade (Habel et al. 2025). Elephant activity contributes indirectly to butterfly persistence: their dung is a critical source of salts and minerals, especially during the dry season and is frequently used by butterflies for nutrient supplementation (Larsen 1996; see also Suppl. material 1: fig. S3). These combined factors, host plant abundance, favourable microclimate and access to nutrient-rich resources, help explain the relatively stable and diverse butterfly assemblages observed in the

mixed forest. Given its structural complexity, ecological stability and richness of butterfly species, the mixed forest can be regarded as a key biodiversity ‘hotspot’ within ASF. Its conservation is therefore of particular importance, especially for sustaining specialist species and buffering biodiversity against climatic and anthropogenic pressures.

Butterfly wingspan sizes across forest types

Butterfly wingspan sizes across forest types were significantly different at the forest edge compared to *Cynometra* forest. This can be attributed to the open-canopy state of the forest edge compared to the closed and dense forest type of the *Cynometra* forest (Hill et al. 2001). Concomitantly, butterflies with larger wing sizes can be more abundant in forest gaps which exhibit a wide flight area favouring large-size butterflies. This argument supports our results and explains the high abundance of larger wing-size butterfly at the forest edge (Hill et al. 2001).

Oligophagous species constituted the largest share of individuals across all forest types, accounting for 67.5% of butterflies at the forest edge and reaching up to 63.4% in the mixed forest. The higher relative abundance of oligophagous butterfly species at the forest edge likely reflects the favourable ecological conditions typical of ecotonal environments. Oligophagous species, whose larvae feed on a restricted range of host plants, usually within a single plant family or a few related genera, combine a degree of specialisation with moderate flexibility in host use. This feeding strategy allows them to exploit the structurally and floristically diverse vegetation that characterises forest edges. Such areas generally support a greater diversity and density of sun-loving host plants and nectar resources compared to the shaded interior of *Brachystegia* and *Cynometra* forests. Similar patterns have been reported in other tropical forest systems, where edge habitats harbour a higher abundance of moderately specialised butterflies due to increased resource heterogeneity and microclimatic variation (Bonebrake et al. 2010).

Conclusion and conservation implication

This study underscores the importance of preserving diverse forest types to conserve both local and regional butterfly diversity. While mixed forest enhances richness and abundance, *Brachystegia* forest contributes disproportionately to beta diversity, emphasising their value in maintaining broader ecological variability. Protecting habitat heterogeneity across the landscape is therefore essential to sustaining butterfly diversity and ecosystem function. This study also highlights the strong positive relationship between vegetation composition and butterfly diversity across different forest types within ASF. Our findings demonstrate that vegetation structure and microclimatic conditions play a pivotal role in shaping butterfly community composition.

Notably, the higher butterfly abundance observed at the forest edge reflects the predominance of ecological-

ly flexible, generalist species rather than greater habitat quality, while the mixed forest functions as a reservoir of host plants for breeding. Nonetheless, while forest edges showed elevated species abundance, this was largely due to the presence of generalist species and did not necessarily reflect high conservation value of specialist butterflies. These results underscore the limitations of using species richness alone as a conservation metric and emphasise the importance of beta diversity and species-specific assessments in evaluating habitat quality. These findings also reinforce the potential use of butterflies as ecological indicators for forest integrity and plant community health.

Given increasing anthropogenic pressures and habitat fragmentation in coastal East Africa, conserving structurally complex and floristically rich forest habitats, like those in ASF, is essential. Such efforts are vital not only for maintaining butterfly diversity, but also for preserving broader ecosystem functionality and resilience. In addition, ASF is known for its butterfly farming activities, conducted by communities adjacent to the forest for conservation and educational purposes. Our results provide valuable insights into the relationship between butterfly diversity and forest types. This will help guide the responsible utilisation and conservation of ASF’s resources, while preserving its ecological integrity.

Funding

This work was funded by a research grant awarded to Maria Fungomeli through the International Association of Butterfly Exhibitors and Suppliers (IABES).

Acknowledgements

We thank the team that led to the large field sampling of the coastal forests of Kenya. Our thanks to Saidi Chidzinga, Charo Ngumbao, Abbas Shariff and Geoffrey Mashauri for the butterfly and plants survey. We are grateful to the colleagues who helped in setting the fieldwork, sampling and support during the entire field period: Anthony Githitho, Lawrence Chiro and Abdulrahman Matano of Coastal forests conservation unit-NMK; Joseph Muthini of Kenya Forest Research Institute; and George Wara and Blessington Magangha of Kenya Forest Service. We thank the reviewers for their constructive comments and suggestions, which have improved the final quality of this manuscript.

References

- Aguirre-Gutiérrez J, WallisDeVries MF, Marshall L, Zelfde MV, Villalobos-Arambula AR, Boekelo B, Bartholomeus H, Franzen M, Biesmeijer JC (2017) Butterflies show different functional and species diversity in relationship to vegetation structure and land use. *Global Ecology and Biogeography* 26: 1126–1137. <https://doi.org/10.1111/geb.12622>
- Arabuko-Sokoke Forest Management Team (2002) Arabuko-Sokoke Strategic Forest Management Plan 2002–2027. Available in Kenya

- from: Forest Department, Kenya Wildlife Service, Kenya Forestry Research Institute, National Museums of Kenya, Nature Kenya, and in UK from: BirdLife International.
- Ayiemba WO (1995) A study of the butterfly diversity of Arabuko-Sokoke Forest, Kenya. Dissertation, University of Nairobi.
- Ayiemba WO (2003) The utilisation of Arabuko Sokoke Forest butterflies is sustainable. In: Hoorweg J, Muthiga N (Eds) Recent Advances in Coastal Ecology, Studies from Kenya.
- Azeria ET, Sanmartin I, Stephan AS, Carlson A, Burgess ND (2007) Biogeographic patterns of the East African coastal forest vertebrate fauna. *Biodiversity and Conservation* 16: 883–912. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10531-006-9022-0>
- Baselga A, Orme D, Villeger S, De Bortoli J, Leprieux F, Logez M, Martinez-Santalla S, Martin-Devasa R, Gomez-Rodriguez C, Crujeiras R (2017) betapart: Partitioning Beta Diversity into Turnover and Nestedness Components. R package version 1.6. <https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/betapart>
- Blair RB, Launer AE (1997) Butterfly diversity and human land use: species assemblages along an urban gradient. *Biological Conservation* 80: 113–125. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0006-3207\(96\)00056-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0006-3207(96)00056-0)
- Beentje HJ (1994) Kenya Trees, Shrubs and Lianas. National Museums of Kenya, Nairobi, Kenya.
- Bobo KS, Waltert M, Fermon H, Njokagbor J, Mühlenberg M (2006) From forest to farmland: butterfly diversity and habitat associations along a gradient of forest conversion in Southwestern Cameroon. *Journal of Insect Conservation* 10: 29–42. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10841-005-8564-x>
- BOLD (2023) Barcode Of Life Data (BOLD) Systems taxonomy database. <https://v3.boldsystems.org> [Accessed 13 August 2023]
- Bonebrake TC, Ponisio LC, Boggs CL, Ehrlich PR (2010) More than just indicators: A review of tropical butterfly ecology and conservation. *Biological Conservation* 143: 1831–1841. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2010.04.044>
- Bouyer J, Sana Y, Samandoulgou Y, Cesar J, Guerrini L, Kabore-Zoungnan C, Dulieu D (2007) Identification of ecological indicators for monitoring ecosystem health in the trans-boundary W Regional park: A pilot study. *Biological Conservation* 138: 73–88. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2007.04.001>
- Braak CJF, Schaffers AP (2004) Co-Correspondence Analysis: A new ordination method to relate two community compositions. *Ecology* 85: 834–846. <https://doi.org/10.1890/03-0021>
- Braby MF (1995) Reproductive seasonality in tropical satyrine butterflies: strategies for the dry season. *Ecological Entomology* 20: 5–17. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2311.1995.tb00423.x>
- Bray JR, Curtis JT (1957) An ordination of the upland forest communities of Southern Wisconsin. *Ecological Monographs* 27: 325–349. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1942268>
- Brakefield PM, Larsen TB (2008) The evolutionary significance of dry and wet season forms in some tropical butterflies. *Biological Journal of the Linnean Society* 22: 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1095-8312.1984.tb00795.x>
- Burgess ND, Clarke GP, Rodgers WA (1998) Coastal Forests of Eastern Africa: Status, Endemism Patterns and their potential causes. *Biological Journal of the Linnean Society* 64: 337–367. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1095-8312.1998.tb00337.x>
- Burgess ND, Clarke GP [Eds] (2000) The coastal forests of Eastern Africa. IUCN, Gland, Switzerland and Cambridge, UK.
- Busck-Lumholt LM, Treue T (2018) Institutional challenges to the conservation of Arabuko Sokoke Coastal Forest in Kenya. *International Forestry Review* 20: 488–505. <https://doi.org/10.1505/146554818825240665>
- Castro A, Espinosa CI (2015) Seasonal diversity of butterflies and its relationship with woody-Plant Resources Availability in an Ecuadorian Tropical Dry Forest. *Tropical Conservation Science*: 8: 333–351. <https://doi.org/10.1177/194008291500800205>
- Chao A, Chiu CH, Jost L (2014) Unifying species diversity, phylogenetic diversity, functional diversity, and related similarity and differentiation measures through Hill numbers. *Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics* 45: 297–324. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-ecolsys-120213-091540>
- Checa MF, Rodriguez J, Willmott KR, Liger B (2014) Microclimate variability significantly affects the composition, abundance and phenology of butterfly communities in a highly threatened neotropical dry forest. *Florida Entomologist* 97: 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1653/024.097.0101>
- Coley PD, Barone JA (1996) Herbivory and plant defenses in tropical forests. *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics* 27: 305–335. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.ecolsys.27.1.305>
- Collinge SK, Prudic KL, Oliver JC (2003) Effects of local habitat characteristics and landscape context on grassland butterfly diversity. *Conservation Biology* 17: 178–187. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1523-1739.2003.01315.x>
- Courtney SP, Hill CJ, Westerman A (1982) Pollen carried for long periods by butterflies. *Oikos* 38: 260–263. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3544030>
- Dobson F (2012) Butterflies act as wildlife indicators, warning us of ecosystem changes. <https://www.enn.com/articles/45000>
- Fanshawe JH (1995) The Effects of Selective Logging on the Bird Community of Arabuko-Sokoke Forest, Kenya. Dissertation, University of Oxford.
- FAO (2018) The State of the World's Forests 2018 – Forest pathways to sustainable development. Rome. Licence: CC BY-NC-SA 3.0 IGO. <http://www.fao.org/state-of-forests/en/>
- Fick SE, Hijmans RJ (2017) Worldclim 2: New 1-km spatial resolution climate surfaces for global land areas. *International Journal of Climatology* 37: 4302–4315. <https://doi.org/10.1002/joc.5086>
- Fungomeli M, Mensuro G, Kioko E (2025) Land use and land cover changes in the Mijikenda Kaya sacred forests of Coastal Kenya: impacts on culture and conservation of UNESCO World Heritage Sites. <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-6119007/v1>
- Fungomeli M, Cianciaruso M, Zannini P, Githitho A, Frascaroli F, Fulanda B, Kibet S, Wiemers M, Mbuvi T, Matiku P, Chiarucci A (2020a) Woody plant species diversity of the coastal forests of Kenya: filling in knowledge gaps in a biodiversity hotspot. *Plant Biosystems* 154: 973–982. <https://doi.org/10.1080/11263504.2020.1834461>
- Fungomeli M, Githitho A, Frascaroli F, Chidzinga S, Cianciaruso M, Chiarucci A (2020b) A new vegetation-plot database for the Coastal forests of Kenya. *Vegetation Classification and Survey* 1: 103–109. <https://doi.org/10.3897/VCS/2020/47180>
- Fungomeli M, Mathenge J, Wairungu S (2001) The economic importance of the Arabuko Sokoke forest water pools to the forest adjacent community as well as forest fauna and flora. Kenya Forest Research Institute, Gede, Kenya. <https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.11146.94406>
- Gordon SCC, Kerr JT (2022) Floral diversity increases butterfly diversity in a multitrophic metacommunity. *Ecology* 103(8): e3735. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ecy.3735>
- Habel J, Constanza I, Zamora C, Teucher M, Hornetz B, Shauri H, Mulwa R, Lens L (2017) East African coastal forest under pressure. *Biodiversity and Conservation* 26: 2751–2758. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10531-017-1375-z>
- Habel JC, Seibold S, Ulrich W, Schmitt T (2018) Seasonality overrides differences in butterfly species composition between natural and

- anthropogenic forest habitats. *Animal Conservation* 21: 405–413. <https://doi.org/10.1111/acv.12408>
- Habel JC, Schmitt T, Fungomeli M, Teucher M, Eberle J, Hanusch M, Ulrich W (2025) Disturbance of coastal forests in East Africa: elephants promote forest butterflies while human impact supports Savannah species. Preprint. <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-6553277/v1>
- Hill J, Hamer K, Tangah J, Dawood M (2001) Ecology of tropical butterflies in rainforest gaps. *Oecologia* 128: 294–302. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s004420100651>
- Heikkinen RK, Luoto M, Leikola N, Pöyry J, Settele J, Kudrna O, Marmion M, Fronzek S, Thuiller W (2009) Assessing the vulnerability of European butterflies to climate change using multiple criteria. *Biodiversity and Conservation* 19: 695–723. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10531-009-9728-x>
- Hsieh TC, Ma KH, Chao A (2016) iNEXT: An R package for rarefaction and extrapolation of species diversity (Hill numbers). *Methods in Ecology and Evolution* 7(12): 1451–1456. <https://doi.org/10.1111/2041-210X.12613>
- Humpden NN, Nathan GN (2010) Effects of plant structure on butterfly diversity in Mt. Marsabit Forest – northern Kenya. *African Journal of Ecology* 48: 304–312. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2028.2009.01151.x>
- Kanga EM (2002) A conservation and recovery plan for the Ader's Duiker *Cephalophus adersi* in Arabuko Sokoke Forest, Kenya. <https://coastalforests.tfcg.org/pubs/AderDuiker-znz.pdf>
- Kitahara M, Yumoto M, Kobayashi T (2008) Relationship of butterfly diversity with nectar plant species richness in and around the Aokigahara primary woodland of Mount Fuji, central Japan. *Biodiversity Conservation* 17: 2713–2734. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10531-007-9265-4>
- Larsen TB (1991) *The Butterflies of Kenya and their Natural History*. Oxford University Press, Oxford. [ISBN: 9780198540113]
- Larsen TB (1993) *Butterfly Conservation Symposium – Keele University*, September 1993.
- Larsen TB (2005) *Butterflies of West Africa*. Apollo Books, Stenstrup. [ISBN: 9788788757439] <https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004531093>
- Legendre P, Borcard D, Peres-Neto P (2005) Analysing beta diversity: Partitioning the spatial variation of community composition data. *Ecological Monographs* 75: 435–450. <https://doi.org/10.1890/05-0549>
- Lien VV (2007) Ecological indicator role of butterflies in Tam Dao National Park, Vietnam. *Russian Entomological Journal* 16: 479–486.
- Lomov B, Keith DA, Britton DR, Hochuli DF (2006) Are butterflies and moths useful indicators for restoration and monitoring? A pilot study in Sydney's Cumberland Plain Woodland. *Ecological Management and Restoration* 7: 204–210. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1442-8903.2006.00310.x>
- MacFarlane DW, Kinzer AT, Banks JE (2015) Coupled human-natural regeneration of indigenous coastal dry forest in Kenya. *Forest Ecology and Management* 354: 149–159. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2015.06.026>
- Manzoor F, Sadat HB, Hina F (2013) Butterflies as indicator of climate change. *Zoo's Print* 28: 19–21.
- Martinez-Sanchez N, Barragan F, Gelviz-Gelvez SM (2020) Temporal analysis of butterfly diversity in a succession gradient in a fragmented tropical landscape of Mexico. *Global Ecology and Conservation* 21: e00847. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gecco.2019.e00847>
- Marín L, León-Cortés JL, Stefanescu C (2009) The effect of an agro-pasture landscape on diversity and migration patterns of frugivorous butterflies in Chiapas, Mexico. *Biodiversity Conservation* 18: 919–934. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10531-008-9540-z>
- Melo DHA, Filgueiras BKC, Iserhard CA, Iannuzzi L, Freita AVL, Leal IR (2019) Effect of habitat loss and fragmentation on fruit-feeding butterflies in the Brazilian Atlantic forest. *Canadian Journal of Zoology* 97: 588–596. <https://doi.org/10.1139/cjz-2018-0202>
- Monastyrskii AL (2007) Ecological and Biogeographical Characteristics of Butterflies (Lepidoptera, Rhopalocera) of Vietnam. *Entomological Review* 87: 43. <https://doi.org/10.1134/S0013873807010058>
- Moomaw JC (1960) *A study of the plant Ecology of the Coast Region of Kenya, East Africa*. Nairobi. Government Printer. <https://edepot.wur.nl/493400>
- Myers N, Mittermeier RA, Mittermeier CG, da Fonseca GAB, Kent J (2000) Biodiversity hotspots for conservation priorities. *Nature* 403: 853–858. <https://doi.org/10.1038/35002501>
- Muchiri MN, Kiriinya CK, Mbithi DM (2001) *Forest Inventory report for the indigenous forests in Arabuko Sokoke Forest Reserve, Arabuko Sokoke Forest Management Project*. Kenya Forestry Research Institute, Gede-Malindi, Kenya.
- Murithi S, Kenyon W (2002) Conservation of biodiversity in the Arabuko Sokoke Forest, Kenya. *Biodiversity and Conservation* 11: 1437–1450. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1016234224819>
- Newton AC, Echeverría C (2014) Analysis of anthropogenic impacts on forest biodiversity as a contribution to empirical theory. In: Coomes DA, Burslem DFRP, Simonson WD (Eds) *Forests and Global Change*. Ecological Reviews. Cambridge University Press, 417–446. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781107323506.019>
- Noad T, Birnie A (1990) *A Fully Illustrated Field Guide: Trees of Kenya*. General Printers Ltd, Nairobi, Kenya.
- Oksanen J, Blanchet FG, Friendly M, Kindt R, Legendre P, McGlenn D, Minchin PR, O'Hara RB, Simpson GL, Solymos P, Stevens MH, Szoecs E, Wagner H (2020) *Vegan: Community Ecology Package*. R package version 2.5-7. <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=vegan>
- Omeng PM (2002) The role of butterfly farming in forest conservation and community development in Kenya.
- Oliveira IF, Baccaro FB, Werneck FP, Zacca T, Haugaasen T (2021) Marked differences in butterfly assemblage composition between forest types in Central Amazonia, Brazil. *Forests* 12: 942. <https://doi.org/10.3390/f12070942>
- Pollard E (1977) A method for assessing changes in the abundance of butterflies. *Biological Conservation* 12: 115–134. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0006-3207\(77\)90065-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/0006-3207(77)90065-9)
- Pollard E, Yates TJ (1993) *Monitoring Butterflies for Ecology and Conservation – The British Butterfly Monitoring Scheme*. Chapman & Hall, London.
- QGIS Development Team (2018) *QGIS Geographic Information System*. Open Source Geospatial Foundation Project. <http://qgis.osgeo.org>
- R Core Team (2020) *R: A language and environment for statistical computing*. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. <https://www.R-project.org/>
- Rader R, Bartomeus I, Garibaldi LA, Garratt MPD, Howlett BG, Winfree R, Cunningham SA, Mayfield MM, Arthur AD, Anderson GKS, Bommarco R, Brittain C, Carvalheiro LG, Chacoff NP, Entling MH, Foully B, Freitas BM, Gemmill-Herren B, Ghazoul J, Griffin SR, Gross CL, Herbertsson L, Herzog F, Hipólito J, Jaggard S, Jauker F, Klein A-M, Kleijn D, Krishnan S, Lemos CQ, Lindström SAM, Mandelik Y, Monteiro VM, Nelson W, Nilsson L, Pattemore DE, Pereira NdeO, Pisanty G, Potts SG, Reemer M, Rundlöf M, Sheffield CS, Scheper J, Schüepp C, Smith HG, Stanley DA, Stout JC, Szentgyörgyi H, Taki H, Vergara CH, Viana BF, Woyciechowski M (2015) Non-bee insects are important contributors to global crop pollination. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 113: 146–151. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1517092112>

- Schweitzer CJ, Dey DC (2011) Forest structure, composition, and tree diversity response to a gradient of regeneration harvests in the mid-cumberland plateau escarpment region, USA. *Forest Ecology and Management* 262: 1729–1741. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2011.07.020>
- Sekar S (2012) A meta-analysis of the traits affecting dispersal ability in butterflies: can wingspan be used as a proxy? *Journal of Animal Ecology* 81: 174–184. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2656.2011.01909.x>
- Simpson GL (2009) cocorresp: Co-correspondence analysis ordination methods. R package version 0.4-1. <http://cran.r-project.org/package=analogue>
- Slowikowski K (2020) ggrepel: automatically position non-overlapping text labels with 'ggplot2'. R package version 0.8.2. <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=ggrepel>
- Steffan-Dewenter I, Tscharntke T (1997) Early succession of butterfly and plant communities on set-aside fields. *Oecologia* 109: 294–302. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s004420050087>
- Thomas CD, Thomas JA, Warren MS (1992) Distributions of occupied and vacant butterfly habitats in fragmented landscapes. *Oecologia* 92: 563–567. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00317850>
- UNESCO [United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, Man and the Biosphere programme] (2019) Thirty-first session-Sc-19/CONF.231/1_v2. UNESCO Headquarters, Paris.
- Vail SP (1992) Selection for over-compensatory plant responses to herbivory: a mechanism for the evolution of plant-herbivore mutualism. *The American Naturalist* 139: 1. <https://doi.org/10.1086/285309>
- Viljuri M, Tiitsaar A, Gimbutas M, Kaasik A, Valdma D, Ounap E, Tammaru T, Teder T (2020) Conserving woodland butterflies in managed forests: Both local and landscape factors matter. *Forest Ecology and Management* 462: 118002. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2020.118002>
- Viola DV, Mordecai EA, Jaramillo AG, Sistla SA, Albertson LK, Gosnell JS et al. (2010) Competition-defence trade-offs and the maintenance of plant diversity. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 107: 17217–17222. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1007745107>
- Vu LV, Bonebrake TC, Vu MQ, Nguyen NT (2015) Butterfly diversity and habitat variation in a disturbed forest in northern Vietnam. *Pan-Pacific Entomologist* 91: 29–38. <https://doi.org/10.3956/2014-91.1.029>
- Whittaker RH (1965) Dominance and diversity in land plant communities: Numerical relations of species express the importance of competition in community function and evolution. *PubMed* 147: 250–360. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.147.3655.250>
- Wickham H (2016) ggplot2: Elegant graphics for data analysis. Springer-Verlag, New York. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-24277-4_9
- Woodhall S (2005) Field Guide to Butterflies of South Africa Cape Town. South Africa: Struik. [ISBN 978-1-86872-724-7]
- Woodhall S (2020) Field guide to butterflies of South Africa: Second Edition. Bloomsbury Publishing. [ISBN: 1472973704, 9781472973702]

Appendix 1

Butterfly species names with author names, genus and family across the forest types of *Brachystegia*, *Cynometra*, Mixed forest and Forest edge in Arabuko Sokoke Forest, Kenya.

Table A1. Butterfly species names with author names, genus and family across the forest types of *Brachystegia*, *Cynometra*, Mixed forest and Forest edge in the Arabuko Sokoke Forest, Kenya.

Species	Family
<i>Acraea anemosa</i> Hewitson, 1865	Nymphalidae
<i>Acraea natalica</i> Boisduval, 1847	Nymphalidae
<i>Acraea rabbaiae</i> Ward, 1873	Nymphalidae
<i>Acraea</i> sp.	Nymphalidae
<i>Acraea zonata</i> Hewitson, 1877	Nymphalidae
<i>Alaena picata</i> Sharpe, 1896	Lycaenidae
<i>Amauris niavius</i> Linnaeus, 1758	Nymphalidae
<i>Amauris ochlea</i> Boisduval, 1847	Nymphalidae
<i>Appias epaphia</i> (Cramer, 1779)	Pieridae
<i>Appias lasti</i> Grose-Smith 1889	Pieridae
<i>Bebearia chriemhilda</i> (Staudinger, 1896)	Nymphalidae
<i>Belenois aurota</i> (Fabricius, 1793)	Pieridae
<i>Belenois creona</i> (Cramer, 1776)	Pieridae
<i>Belenois gidica</i> (Godart, 1819)	Pieridae
<i>Belenois thysa</i> (Hopffer, 1855)	Pieridae
<i>Bicyclus safitza</i> (Westwood, 1850)	Nymphalidae
<i>Byblia ilithyia</i> Drury, 1773	Nymphalidae
<i>Catopsilia florella</i> (Fabricius, 1775)	Pieridae
<i>Charaxes bohemani</i> Felder & Felder, 1859	Nymphalidae
<i>Charaxes brutus</i> Cramer, 1779/80	Nymphalidae
<i>Charaxes candiope</i> Godart, 1824	Nymphalidae
<i>Charaxes castor</i> Cramer, 1775/76	Nymphalidae
<i>Charaxes cithaeron</i> Felder, 1859	Nymphalidae
<i>Charaxes etesipe tavetensis</i> Rothschild, 1894	Nymphalidae
<i>Charaxes guderiana</i> Dewits, 1879	Nymphalidae

Species	Family
<i>Charaxes jahlusa</i> Trimen, 1862	Nymphalidae
<i>Charaxes jasius saturnus</i> Butler, 1866	Nymphalidae
<i>Charaxes lasti</i> Grose-Smith, 1889	Nymphalidae
<i>Charaxes protoclea</i> Feisthamel, 1850	Nymphalidae
<i>Charaxes</i> sp.	Nymphalidae
<i>Charaxes varanes</i> (Cramer, 1764)	Nymphalidae
<i>Charaxes violetta</i> Grose-Smith, 1885	Nymphalidae
<i>Charaxes zoolina</i> Westwood, 1850	Nymphalidae
<i>Coeliades forestan</i> Stoll, 1782	Hesperiidae
<i>Colotis amata</i> (Fabricius, 1775)	Pieridae
<i>Colotis auxo</i> (Lucas, 1852)	Pieridae
<i>Colotis danae</i> (Fabricius, 1775)	Pieridae
<i>Colotis eris</i> (Klug, 1829)	Pieridae
<i>Colotis euippe</i> (Linnaeus, 1758)	Pieridae
<i>Colotis ione</i> (Godart, 1819)	Pieridae
<i>Colotis protomedia</i> (Klug, 1829)	Pieridae
<i>Colotis regina</i> (Trimen, 1863)	Pieridae
<i>Colotis vesta</i> (Reiche, 1850)	Pieridae
<i>Cupidopsis iobates</i> (Hopffer, 1855)	Lycaenidae
<i>Danaus chrysippus dorippus</i> Klug, 1845	Nymphalidae
<i>Dixeia charina</i> (Boisduval, 1836)	Pieridae
<i>Eronia cleodora</i> Hübner, 1823	Pieridae
<i>Euphaedra neophron</i> Hopffer, 1855	Nymphalidae
<i>Eurema</i> sp.	Pieridae
<i>Eurytela dryope</i> Cramer, 1779	Nymphalidae
<i>Euxanthe wakefieldi</i> (Ward, 1873)	Nymphalidae
<i>Graphium angolanus</i> (Goeze, 1779)	Papilionidae
<i>Graphium antheus</i> (Cramer, 1779)	Papilionidae
<i>Graphium colonna</i> (Ward, 1873)	Papilionidae
<i>Graphium kirbyi</i> (Hewitson, 1872)	Papilionidae
<i>Graphium leonidas</i> (Fabricius, 1793)	Papilionidae
<i>Graphium philonoe</i> (Ward, 1873)	Papilionidae
<i>Graphium polices</i> (Cramer, 1775)	Papilionidae
<i>Graphium polistratus</i> (Grose-Smith, 1889)	Papilionidae
<i>Graphium porthaon</i> (Hewitson, 1865)	Papilionidae
<i>Harma theobene</i> Doubleday, [1848]	Nymphalidae
<i>Hypolimnas anthedon</i> (Doubleday, 1845)	Nymphalidae
<i>Hypolimnas deceptor</i> Trimen, 1873	Nymphalidae
<i>Hypolimnas misippus</i> (Linnaeus, 1764)	Nymphalidae
<i>Junonia hierta</i> (Fabricius, 1798)	Nymphalidae
<i>Junonia natalica</i> Felder, 1860	Nymphalidae
<i>Junonia oenone</i> Linnaeus, 1764	Nymphalidae
<i>Leptosia alcesta</i> (Stoll, [1782])	Pieridae
<i>Libythea labdaca</i> Westwood, 1851	Nymphalidae
<i>Melanitis leda</i> Linnaeus, 1758	Nymphalidae
<i>Mylothris agathina</i> (Cramer, 1779)	Pieridae
<i>Nepheronia thalassina</i> (Boisduval, 1836)	Pieridae
<i>Neptis</i> sp.	Nymphalidae
<i>Papilio constantinus</i> Ward, 1871	Papilionidae
<i>Papilio dardanus</i> Brown, 1776	Papilionidae
<i>Papilio demodocus</i> Esper, 1798	Papilionidae
<i>Papilio nireus</i> Linnaeus, 1758	Papilionidae
<i>Pardopsis punctatissima</i> Boisduval, 1833	Nymphalidae
<i>Phalanta phalantha</i> Drury, 1773	Nymphalidae
<i>Physcaeneura leda</i> Gerstaecker, 1871	Nymphalidae
<i>Pinacopteryx eriphia</i> (Godart, 1819)	Pieridae
<i>Pseudacraea boisduvali</i> (Doubleday, 1845)	Nymphalidae
<i>Pseudacraea lucretia</i> (Cramer, 1775)	Nymphalidae
<i>Salamis anacardii</i> Linnaeus, 1758	Nymphalidae
<i>Salamis parhassus</i> Drury, 1782	Nymphalidae
<i>Tirumala petiverana</i> Doubleday, 1847	Nymphalidae

Appendix 2

SIMPER analysis for butterfly species composition dissimilarities results. Highlighted are species that cumulatively contribute up to 70% of the observed dissimilarities.

Table A2. Butterfly species contributing up to 70% of the observed dissimilarities across the sampled forest types of *Brachystegia*, *Cynometra*, Mixed forest and Forest edge in the Arabuko Sokoke forest, Kenya. Where average = the average contribution of a species to the dissimilarity between groups; Sd = standard deviation of the species' contribution, showing variability in how much that species contributes across different sample comparisons; Ratio = the average contribution divided by its standard deviation (average / sd). A higher ratio indicates that the species consistently contributes to dissimilarity (less variable); ava = the average abundance or value of the species in forest A (e.g. *Brachystegia*); avb = the average abundance or value of the species in forest type B (e.g. *Cynometra*); cumsum = the cumulative sum of the contributions up to the current species, usually expressed as a percentage of total dissimilarity explained so far. This helps identify which species collectively contribute to a specified threshold (e.g., 70%); P-value = statistical significance testing the contribution of that species to the dissimilarity, lower values (typically < 0.05) suggest the species contributes significantly to differences between groups.

Species	average	sd	ratio	ava	avb	Cumsum	% of total dissimilarity	P-value
Brachystegia vs Cynometra								
<i>Phalanta phalantha</i>	0.030	0.022	1.330	2.143	1.564	0.049	4.9	0.001
<i>Catopsilia florella</i>	0.027	0.023	1.160	1.234	1.646	0.094	9.4	0.002
<i>Appias epaphia</i>	0.026	0.022	1.147	1.549	1.828	0.137	13.7	0.001
<i>Hypolimnas misippus</i>	0.025	0.021	1.184	0.959	1.151	0.178	17.8	0.002
<i>Colotis regina</i>	0.023	0.021	1.121	0.397	1.122	0.217	21.7	0.001
<i>Graphium philonoe</i>	0.022	0.019	1.181	0.606	1.190	0.254	25.4	0.001
<i>Graphium antheus</i>	0.022	0.020	1.112	1.010	1.018	0.291	29.1	0.002
<i>Papilio demodocus</i>	0.022	0.018	1.202	1.106	0.977	0.327	32.7	0.006
<i>Neptis sp.</i>	0.022	0.019	1.154	0.884	1.001	0.363	36.3	0.001
<i>Junonia oenone</i>	0.020	0.017	1.195	0.958	0.841	0.397	39.7	0.031
<i>Colotis euipe</i>	0.018	0.018	1.034	0.784	0.569	0.427	42.7	0.025
<i>Eronia cleodora</i>	0.018	0.017	1.080	0.700	0.785	0.458	45.8	0.023
<i>Graphium porthaon</i>	0.017	0.017	1.013	0.553	0.665	0.487	48.7	0.116
<i>Colotis auxo</i>	0.017	0.015	1.123	0.427	0.739	0.515	51.5	0.001
<i>Hypolimnas deceptor</i>	0.017	0.018	0.968	0.000	0.741	0.544	54.4	0.001
<i>Coeliades forestan</i>	0.017	0.017	0.974	0.628	0.668	0.572	57.2	1.000
<i>Acraea sp.</i>	0.017	0.016	1.072	0.612	0.729	0.600	60.0	0.006
<i>Charaxes candiope</i>	0.016	0.015	1.036	0.037	0.705	0.625	62.5	0.001
<i>Pardopsis punctatissima</i>	0.015	0.016	0.946	0.552	0.501	0.651	65.1	0.001
<i>Bicyclus safitza</i>	0.014	0.016	0.910	0.154	0.616	0.675	67.5	0.001
<i>Eurema sp.</i>	0.014	0.023	0.632	0.639	0.117	0.699	69.9	0.573
Brachystegia vs Forest edge								
<i>Coeliades forestan</i>	0.033	0.018	1.828	0.628	2.529	0.055	5.5	0.001
<i>Hypolimnas misippus</i>	0.021	0.015	1.364	0.959	1.738	0.090	9.0	0.183
<i>Junonia oenone</i>	0.021	0.015	1.331	0.958	1.743	0.124	12.4	0.022
<i>Papilio demodocus</i>	0.020	0.017	1.142	1.106	1.910	0.158	15.8	0.084
<i>Catopsilia florella</i>	0.020	0.019	1.034	1.234	1.415	0.191	19.1	0.809
<i>Phalanta phalantha</i>	0.019	0.023	0.846	2.143	2.479	0.224	22.4	0.941
<i>Appias epaphia</i>	0.019	0.018	1.063	1.549	2.052	0.255	25.5	0.489
<i>Eurema sp.</i>	0.019	0.018	1.052	0.639	1.176	0.287	28.7	0.006
<i>Graphium antheus</i>	0.018	0.016	1.126	1.010	1.316	0.317	31.7	0.445
<i>Colotis ione</i>	0.018	0.016	1.126	0.295	1.185	0.347	34.7	0.001
<i>Colotis euipe</i>	0.017	0.015	1.144	0.784	1.144	0.375	37.5	0.261
<i>Eronia cleodora</i>	0.017	0.014	1.182	0.700	1.213	0.403	40.3	0.509
<i>Papilio nireus</i>	0.016	0.012	1.310	0.641	1.299	0.430	43.0	0.023
<i>Graphium philonoe</i>	0.016	0.015	1.090	0.606	0.993	0.457	45.7	0.901
<i>Graphium porthaon</i>	0.016	0.013	1.202	0.553	1.087	0.483	48.3	0.660
<i>Danaus chrysippus</i>	0.015	0.014	1.117	0.276	0.991	0.509	50.9	0.002
<i>Euphaedra neophron</i>	0.015	0.012	1.261	0.482	1.105	0.534	53.4	0.007
<i>Belenois creona</i>	0.015	0.015	1.010	0.191	0.974	0.559	55.9	0.001
<i>Papilio constantinus</i>	0.014	0.015	0.930	0.000	0.836	0.584	58.4	0.001

Species	average	sd	ratio	ava	avb	Cumsum	% of total dissimilarity	P-value
<i>Neptis</i> sp.	0.014	0.014	1.019	0.884	0.548	0.607	60.7	0.957
<i>Charaxes varanes</i>	0.014	0.012	1.104	0.574	0.871	0.630	63.0	0.027
<i>Nepheronia thalassina</i>	0.013	0.012	1.125	0.268	0.872	0.652	65.2	0.345
<i>Acraea</i> sp.	0.013	0.012	1.058	0.612	0.719	0.674	67.4	0.980
<i>Colotis regina</i>	0.012	0.013	0.980	0.397	0.700	0.694	69.4	0.974
Brachystegia vs Mixed forest								
<i>Phalanta phalantha</i>	0.026	0.025	1.055	2.143	2.320	0.045	4.5	0.073
<i>Hypolimnna misippus</i>	0.022	0.019	1.189	0.959	1.449	0.082	8.2	0.029
<i>Catopsilia florella</i>	0.022	0.020	1.114	1.234	1.560	0.120	12.0	0.285
<i>Appias epaphia</i>	0.021	0.018	1.195	1.549	2.229	0.155	15.5	0.123
<i>Papilio demodocus</i>	0.019	0.018	1.070	1.106	1.518	0.188	18.8	0.192
<i>Graphium porthaon</i>	0.019	0.017	1.105	0.553	1.144	0.220	22.0	0.008
<i>Graphium antheus</i>	0.018	0.017	1.088	1.010	1.087	0.251	25.1	0.285
<i>Eronia cleodora</i>	0.018	0.016	1.147	0.700	1.032	0.281	28.1	0.072
<i>Junonia oenone</i>	0.018	0.015	1.226	0.958	0.934	0.311	31.1	0.795
<i>Graphium philonoe</i>	0.018	0.015	1.175	0.606	1.201	0.341	34.1	0.433
<i>Colotis euippe</i>	0.017	0.014	1.208	0.784	1.142	0.370	37.0	0.262
<i>Papilio nireus</i>	0.017	0.015	1.144	0.641	1.185	0.399	39.9	0.002
<i>Neptis</i> sp.	0.016	0.015	1.060	0.884	0.926	0.427	42.7	0.347
<i>Nepheronia thalassina</i>	0.016	0.015	1.060	0.268	0.940	0.454	45.4	0.001
<i>Acraea</i> sp.	0.016	0.015	1.075	0.612	0.999	0.481	48.1	0.033
<i>Coeliades forestan</i>	0.016	0.016	1.019	0.628	0.921	0.508	50.8	0.999
<i>Eurema</i> sp.	0.016	0.020	0.797	0.639	0.669	0.535	53.5	0.332
<i>Belenois thysa</i>	0.015	0.013	1.120	0.265	0.922	0.560	56.0	0.001
<i>Papilio constantinus</i>	0.015	0.015	1.008	0.000	0.843	0.585	58.5	0.001
<i>Euphaedra neophron</i>	0.013	0.014	0.990	0.482	0.710	0.608	60.8	0.403
<i>Charaxes varanes</i>	0.013	0.012	1.078	0.574	0.823	0.630	63.0	0.092
<i>Junonia natalica</i>	0.012	0.013	0.953	0.845	1.201	0.651	65.1	0.157
<i>Danaus chrysippus</i>	0.012	0.013	0.896	0.276	0.668	0.671	67.1	0.424
<i>Colotis auxo</i>	0.012	0.013	0.874	0.427	0.547	0.691	69.1	0.831
Cynometra vs Forest edge								
<i>Coeliades forestan</i>	0.030	0.016	1.934	0.668	2.529	0.051	5.1	0.001
<i>Phalanta phalantha</i>	0.021	0.018	1.162	1.564	2.479	0.087	8.7	0.771
<i>Papilio nireus</i>	0.020	0.009	2.146	0.000	1.299	0.121	12.1	0.001
<i>Junonia oenone</i>	0.020	0.015	1.317	0.841	1.743	0.154	15.4	0.116
<i>Catopsilia florella</i>	0.020	0.018	1.067	1.646	1.415	0.187	18.7	0.849
<i>Papilio demodocus</i>	0.018	0.014	1.349	0.977	1.910	0.218	21.8	0.422
<i>Graphium philonoe</i>	0.018	0.015	1.197	1.190	0.993	0.247	24.7	0.499
<i>Hypolimnna misippus</i>	0.017	0.014	1.228	1.151	1.738	0.275	27.5	0.972
<i>Colotis ione</i>	0.017	0.014	1.153	0.445	1.185	0.303	30.3	0.004
<i>Appias epaphia</i>	0.017	0.015	1.129	1.828	2.052	0.331	33.1	0.902
<i>Colotis regina</i>	0.016	0.014	1.161	1.122	0.700	0.359	35.9	0.153
<i>Eurema</i> sp.	0.016	0.015	1.091	0.117	1.176	0.386	38.6	0.209
<i>Colotis euippe</i>	0.016	0.014	1.151	0.569	1.144	0.413	41.3	0.663
<i>Graphium antheus</i>	0.016	0.014	1.126	1.018	1.316	0.440	44.0	0.932
<i>Eronia cleodora</i>	0.015	0.013	1.160	0.785	1.213	0.465	46.5	0.968
<i>Danaus chrysippus</i>	0.015	0.013	1.134	0.163	0.991	0.490	49.0	0.004
<i>Neptis</i> sp.	0.015	0.014	1.035	1.001	0.548	0.514	51.4	0.870
<i>Graphium porthaon</i>	0.014	0.013	1.151	0.665	1.087	0.538	53.8	0.931
<i>Euphaedra neophron</i>	0.014	0.011	1.309	0.379	1.105	0.562	56.2	0.097
<i>Belenois creona</i>	0.014	0.014	0.994	0.000	0.974	0.586	58.6	0.001
<i>Charaxes varanes</i>	0.014	0.012	1.129	0.000	0.871	0.609	60.9	0.016
<i>Papilio constantinus</i>	0.013	0.014	0.979	0.000	0.836	0.632	63.2	0.003
<i>Acraea</i> sp.	0.013	0.012	1.102	0.729	0.719	0.654	65.4	0.982
<i>Hypolimnna deceptor</i>	0.013	0.012	1.014	0.741	0.503	0.675	67.5	0.114
<i>Nepheronia thalassina</i>	0.012	0.011	1.141	0.465	0.872	0.695	69.5	0.777

Species	average	sd	ratio	ava	avb	Cumsum	% of total dissimilarity	P-value
Cynometra vs Mixed forest								
<i>Phalanta phalantha</i>	0.026	0.019	1.330	1.564	2.320	0.045	4.5	0.112
<i>Catopsilia florella</i>	0.021	0.018	1.170	1.646	1.560	0.080	8.0	0.604
<i>Papilio nireus</i>	0.020	0.012	1.649	0.000	1.185	0.115	11.5	0.001
<i>Hypolimnas misippus</i>	0.020	0.017	1.159	1.151	1.449	0.149	14.9	0.425
<i>Colotis regina</i>	0.019	0.017	1.073	1.122	0.429	0.181	18.1	0.003
<i>Appias epaphia</i>	0.018	0.014	1.259	1.828	2.229	0.212	21.2	0.687
<i>Graphium porthaon</i>	0.018	0.016	1.154	0.665	1.144	0.243	24.3	0.048
<i>Graphium philonoe</i>	0.017	0.015	1.162	1.190	1.201	0.273	27.3	0.636
<i>Papilio demodocus</i>	0.017	0.014	1.224	0.977	1.518	0.302	30.2	0.832
<i>Eronia cleodora</i>	0.017	0.014	1.169	0.785	1.032	0.330	33.0	0.417
<i>Neptis</i> sp.	0.017	0.015	1.124	1.001	0.926	0.359	35.9	0.267
<i>Junonia oenone</i>	0.017	0.014	1.182	0.841	0.934	0.387	38.7	0.990
<i>Colotis euippe</i>	0.017	0.013	1.263	0.569	1.142	0.416	41.6	0.492
<i>Graphium antheus</i>	0.017	0.015	1.090	1.018	1.087	0.444	44.4	0.857
<i>Acraea</i> sp.	0.015	0.014	1.101	0.729	0.999	0.470	47.0	0.214
<i>Coeliades forestan</i>	0.015	0.014	1.062	0.668	0.921	0.496	49.6	1.000
<i>Nepheronia thalassina</i>	0.015	0.014	1.080	0.465	0.940	0.521	52.1	0.023
<i>Belenois thysa</i>	0.014	0.012	1.153	0.444	0.922	0.545	54.5	0.002
<i>Papilio constantinus</i>	0.014	0.014	1.025	0.000	0.843	0.569	56.9	0.001
<i>Hypolimnas deceptor</i>	0.014	0.014	1.018	0.741	0.513	0.593	59.3	0.009
<i>Charaxes varanes</i>	0.014	0.011	1.282	0.000	0.823	0.616	61.6	0.026
<i>Colotis auxo</i>	0.013	0.012	1.092	0.739	0.547	0.639	63.9	0.202
<i>Bicyclus safitza</i>	0.013	0.013	0.951	0.616	0.447	0.661	66.1	0.015
<i>Charaxes candiope</i>	0.012	0.012	1.008	0.705	0.179	0.682	68.2	0.001
<i>Euphaedra neophron</i>	0.012	0.012	0.997	0.379	0.710	0.703	70.3	0.912
Forest edge vs Mixed forest								
<i>Coeliades forestan</i>	0.025	0.015	1.612	2.529	0.921	0.047	4.7	0.003
<i>Junonia oenone</i>	0.018	0.014	1.352	1.743	0.934	0.082	8.2	0.648
<i>Phalanta phalantha</i>	0.017	0.019	0.901	2.479	2.320	0.114	11.4	0.995
<i>Catopsilia florella</i>	0.017	0.015	1.070	1.415	1.560	0.145	14.5	0.998
<i>Eurema</i> sp.	0.015	0.013	1.116	1.176	0.669	0.174	17.4	0.471
<i>Colotis ione</i>	0.015	0.014	1.084	1.185	0.662	0.201	20.1	0.189
<i>Graphium philonoe</i>	0.015	0.012	1.231	0.993	1.201	0.229	22.9	0.995
<i>Colotis euippe</i>	0.014	0.011	1.250	1.144	1.142	0.256	25.6	0.994
<i>Eronia cleodora</i>	0.014	0.012	1.185	1.213	1.032	0.283	28.3	0.995
<i>Hypolimnas misippus</i>	0.014	0.013	1.091	1.738	1.449	0.310	31.0	1.000
<i>Graphium antheus</i>	0.014	0.013	1.103	1.316	1.087	0.336	33.6	0.999
<i>Graphium porthaon</i>	0.013	0.012	1.115	1.087	1.144	0.361	36.1	0.999
<i>Papilio demodocus</i>	0.013	0.013	1.005	1.910	1.518	0.387	38.7	0.997
<i>Danaus chrysippus</i>	0.013	0.012	1.097	0.991	0.668	0.411	41.1	0.143
<i>Appias epaphia</i>	0.013	0.011	1.117	2.052	2.229	0.434	43.4	1.000
<i>Acraea</i> sp.	0.013	0.011	1.104	0.719	0.999	0.458	45.8	0.991
<i>Belenois creona</i>	0.012	0.013	0.995	0.974	0.175	0.482	48.2	0.001
<i>Euphaedra neophron</i>	0.012	0.010	1.154	1.105	0.710	0.504	50.4	0.948
<i>Papilio constantinus</i>	0.012	0.011	1.054	0.836	0.843	0.526	52.6	0.087
<i>Nepheronia thalassina</i>	0.012	0.011	1.046	0.872	0.940	0.548	54.8	0.919
<i>Neptis</i> sp.	0.011	0.011	1.056	0.548	0.926	0.570	57.0	1.000
<i>Belenois thysa</i>	0.011	0.010	1.109	0.329	0.922	0.592	59.2	0.520
<i>Graphium colonna</i>	0.011	0.011	0.993	0.771	0.577	0.612	61.2	0.581
<i>Charaxes varanes</i>	0.011	0.009	1.157	0.871	0.823	0.633	63.3	0.960
<i>Colotis regina</i>	0.011	0.011	0.964	0.700	0.429	0.653	65.3	0.998
<i>Junonia natalica</i>	0.010	0.011	0.912	0.992	1.201	0.671	67.1	0.929
<i>Melanitis leda</i>	0.010	0.009	1.035	0.648	0.574	0.689	68.9	0.174
<i>Hypolimnas deceptor</i>	0.010	0.011	0.859	0.503	0.513	0.707	70.7	0.882

Supplementary material 1

Suppl. figures S1–S3

Authors: Maria Fungomeli, Martin Wiemers, Lucia Calderini, Alessandro Chiarucci

Data type: pdf

Explanation note: **figure S1.** Frequency ranking of butterfly species abundance within the forest types of *Brachystegia*, *Cynometra*, Mixed forest and Forest edge in Arabuko Sokoke Forest, Kenya. **figure S2.** Abundance proportions of butterfly species with monophagous, oligophagous and polyphagous larval feeding habits across the four forest types of *Brachystegia*, *Cynometra*, Mixed forest and Forest edge in Arabuko Sokoke Forest, Kenya. **figure S3.** Butterflies in Arabuko Sokoke Forest, in the mixed forest vegetation type, feeding from elephant dung during the field sampling in the dry season. Photo credits: Maria Fungomeli.

Copyright notice: This dataset is made available under the Open Database License (<http://opendatacommons.org/licenses/odbl/1.0>). The Open Database License (ODbL) is a license agreement intended to allow users to freely share, modify, and use this Dataset while maintaining this same freedom for others, provided that the original source and author(s) are credited.

Link: <https://doi.org/10.3897/contrib.entomol.75.e155016.suppl1>
