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Summary

In this contribution we discuss the distribution and ecology of some Asilid flies, captured in sandy regions of Flanders, within the framework of some large invertebrate survey projects conducted at the Royal Belgian Institute of Natural Sciences and the University of Ghent. A total of 14 species were found, from which several are extremely rare: Antipalus varipes, Asilus crabroniformis, Machimus arthriticus and Pamponerus germanicus. Their distribution and ecology is discussed. We also propose a Red List status for the captured species.
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Introduction

In our temperate regions, Asilid flies are in their adult life stage active predators, which catch their prey mainly during flight. Almost all our Belgian species are typical for undisturbed areas and can thus be used as bio-indicators in semi-natural open and thermophile habitats.

In Belgium, Asilid flies are mainly found in the Pleistocene sandy regions of inner-Flanders, the coastal dunes, and the area of Sambere-Meuse in the South of the country. VERLINDEN (1982) could identify six large biogeographical districts, based on the collections at the Royal Belgian Institute of Natural sciences. TOMASOVIC (1998) summarised the distribution and the evolution of Asilid flies in Belgium and found that most of the species (probably with the exception of Laphria flava and Neoitamus socius) are declining in our region.

Although a basic knowledge is present on the distribution of Asilid flies in our country, almost no ecological or applied ecological research has been done till now. Only TOMASOVIC & DEKONINCK (2000) investigated the presence of Asilid flies in the inner dunes of Eastern Flanders in function of the ground use. They concluded that the species composition could differ strongly between analogue sandy areas within the same region. Their results indicated that Asilid flies, despite of their well developed flying capacity, are poor colonisers since they were almost completely absent from recently cleared forests, but potentially suitable inner dunes. In a way they can be seen as the counter actors of Therevid flies from which is shown that they are typical pioneer species (GROOTAERT et al., 2001).

In this contribution we give an overview of new records on the distribution of Asilid flies in sandy regions in Flanders. We especially focus on the paucity of the Asilid fauna in the Flemish coastal dunes and differences in their phenology. The ecology of some species is finally discussed.

Material and Methods

The data, presented here could be gathered within the framework of some large survey projects, coordinated at the Royal Belgian Institute of Natural Sciences, department Entomology and the University of Ghent, Lab of Animal Ecology. Parts of the results are already published by TOMASOVIC & DEKONINCK (2000). Additional data were obtained from inventory projects in Eastern Flanders (projects AMINAL-Eastern Flanders, evaluation of the invertebrate fauna of some humid inland dunes and on the road verges in Waasmunster – DEKONINCK & GROOTAERT,
Table 1. Overview of the sampled localities, the habitat characterisation, sampling methodology and sampling year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Locality</th>
<th>habitat</th>
<th>Sampling methodology</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>De Panne</td>
<td>coastal dunes (grassland, marram dunes, grey dunes, dune slack)</td>
<td>white pitfalls</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-9</td>
<td>De Panne</td>
<td>coastal dunes, grassland</td>
<td>white pitfalls</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-11</td>
<td>Ghyvelde-Adinkerke</td>
<td>coastal dunes, grassland, grey dune</td>
<td>white pitfalls</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-14</td>
<td>Ursel</td>
<td>grassland</td>
<td>white pantraps</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-18</td>
<td>Heidebos, Moerbeke</td>
<td>heathland, grassland</td>
<td>white pantraps</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Serskamp</td>
<td>grassland</td>
<td>hand catches</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-21</td>
<td>Opgrimbie, Kikbeek</td>
<td>heathland</td>
<td>white pantraps</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Hageven, Neerpelt</td>
<td>heathland</td>
<td>white pantraps</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-27</td>
<td>Road verges E17, Waasmunster</td>
<td>heathland, grey dunes</td>
<td>hand catches</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Schobbejakshoogte, Brugge</td>
<td>heathland, grey dune</td>
<td>white pantraps</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Honegem-Reeprook</td>
<td>woodland</td>
<td>white pantraps</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-42</td>
<td>Stropers, Stekene</td>
<td>grassland</td>
<td>white pantraps</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Total number of the captured species per locality.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Antipalus variipes (Meig.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asilus crabroniformis (L.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dioctria atricapilla Meig.</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dioctria cothurnata Meig.</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dioctria oelandica L.</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dysmachus trigonus Meig.</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eutolmus rufigibb (Meig.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lasiopogon cinctus (Fab.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machimus atriticus Zeller</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machimus atricapillus Fallén</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machimus cingulatus Fabr.</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoitamus cyanurus (Leow.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamponerus germanicus (L.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philonicus albiceps (Meig.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2001), the coastal dunes (Project AMINAL-monitoring of dune management) and Limburg (VLINA-project-evaluation of Nature restoration on former arable fields). All animals were inventoried with white pan or pitfall traps. Additional data are included from net sampling in the Kikbeek-area in Limburg and the Schobbejakshoogte in Brugge (ZWAENEPOEL, pers. comm.). An overview of the sampled places and the sampling methodology is given in Table 1. The sites are visualised on Figure 1.

For the most common species (Dysmachus trigonus, Lasiopogon cinctus, Machimus atrica-

Fig. 1. Localisation of the different sampled areas.
pillus, M. cingulatus and Philonicus a/biceps), we analysed habitat preference by non-linear regression of the species' abundance per plot (if sampled with three white pan-traps or five white pitfall traps, which had in total similar trapping surface) with the recorded habitat parameters 'distance to woodland, surface of bare sand and vegetation height'. We also calculated the sex-ratio mm/ff and compared it with an equal sex-ratio via $\chi^2$-tests.

Finally, we attempt to define the species' Red list status in Flanders, based on their known distribution, habitat preference and trend (Tomasic, 1998).

Results

General results

A total of 1660 individuals were identified, belonging to 14 species (Table 2). D. trigonus, L. cinctus, M. atricapillus, M. cingulatus and Philonicus a/biceps were both in abundance and number of localities the most common species. Rare captured species were Asilus crabroniformis, Dioctria cothurnata, Dioctria oelandica, Machimus arthriticus and Pamponerus germanicus.

Ecology and distribution

Antipalus varipes

A. varipes was only recorded in the inland dunes in Eastern Flanders, where well-developed heathland was present (Fig. 2). In Belgium, this species is very rare (Tomasic, 1998). Tomasic & Dekonick (2000) found the species in Sint Martens Latem, Wetteren and Moerbeke. Our study reveals the presence of a population along the road verges of the E17 in Waasmunster. The sex-ratio mm/ff was 0.18, indicating that especially females were caught. The species can be found during the months July and August (Fig. 3).

Asilus crabroniformis

This is the first documented record of this coprophytic species since 1963 (Tomasic, 1998). During the recent sampling campaign, this species was only found in the Hageven-reserve, a nature reserve with large areas of short grass- and heathland, grazed by Galloway-cattle. A total of 5 females and 1 male were captured in these habitats, during July-September (Fig. 4).

Dioctria atricapilla, D. cothurnata and D. oelandica

Only one individual of each species was caught during the different inventories. One male D. atricapilla was found in Moerbeke in the first half of July (Fig. 5). This is probably the only species which can be found in large numbers outside the sandy regions of Flanders and the
Fig. 5. The occurrence of *Dioctria atricapilla* in the sampled areas.

Netherlands (Van Veen, 1996). One male of *D. cothurnata* was found during the same period in the Hageven-reserve. These species are fairly common on sandy soils, but doesn’t prefer typical oligotrophic vegetation (Van der Goot, 1985; Tomasovic, 1998). They can both be found in woodlands, dense grasslands in both humid and dry situations (Van Veen, 1996). Because of their leaf-hunting behaviour, these species are probably difficult to survey with pantraps.

*D. oelandica* is the rarest species of the three (Tomasovic, 1998), for which the number of localities is strongly declining. A male was found in the first half of July in the Hageven. The species is typical for wooded heathland areas (Van der Goot, 1985; Van Veen, 1996).

**Dysmachus trigonus**

This is probably the most common Asilid fly in Flanders, which can be found on open sandy grounds. In the coastal dunes, this species is also very common (Fig. 6).

Our analysis of the species’ habitat preference indicates that the species doesn’t have any preferences for height of the grass-vegetation or the amount of bare sand. The absence of the species in a recently optimised habitat in Uitbergen (Tomasovic & Dekonink, 2000), indicates however that the species is a bad coloniser. The species can be found from the beginning of May till September. Interesting is that the species occurs a half a month later in the coastal dunes, in comparison with inland data (Fig. 7a,b & Tomasovic & Dekonink, 2000). The peak in the phenology is also a month later in the coastal dunes, indicating a possible effect of lower temperatures during the spring and summer on the species’ larval development. The sex-ratio mm/ff is 1.28 and not significantly different from one ($\chi^2$-test, p>0.05).

**Eutolmus rufifarbis**

This species is also rare in our country and declining (Tomasovic, 1998). We only caught two males and one female in Neerpelt (Fig. 8) in the second half of June and the first half of July. Tomasovic & Dekonink (2000) found howe-
ver two populations in Eastern Flanders. The species is rare and appears to be bound to open sandy patches in heathland areas. Van Veen (1996) also mentions the species from forest edges on sandy soils.

![Map of Flanders with marked areas]

Fig. 8. The occurrence of Eutolmus rufibarbis in the sampled areas.

**Lasiopogon cinctus**

Tomasovic (1998) considered this species as rare in Belgium. Our surveys indicated that this species is however rather common in the investigated areas, but certainly absent in the Flemish coastal dunes (Fig. 9). The sex ratio was 1.52 and significantly different from one ($\chi^2$-test, $p<0.05$), indicating that more males were caught. *L. cinctus* is active during the spring period (Fig. 10). The species is typical for forest edges in sandy regions, since it reacts significantly to the distant to the forest edge (Fig. 11) and to the amount of bare sand (Fig. 12).

![Graph of Lasiopogon cinctus phenology]

Fig. 10. The phenology of *Lasiopogon cinctus* in the inland dunes of Flanders.

![Graph of Lasiopogon cinctus abundance vs. distance to woodland]

Fig. 11. The abundance of *L. cinctus* in function of the distance to woodland.

![Graphs comparing Lasiopogon cinctus and Penaeus a/biceps abundance]

Fig. 12. The abundance of *L. cinctus* (LC) and *P. a/biceps* (PA) in function of coverage of bare sand.

**Machimus arthriticus**

This species has never been found in Flanders. Only three records are known from Belgium: two from the 19th century (Brussels and Carlsbourg-Luxembourg) and one from Liège in 1970. We found four females and one male in a bare sandy sod cut field in the Hageven-reserve in June and the beginning of July (Fig. 13). In the Netherlands the species is also very rare and restricted.
to the large heathland areas if the Veluwe (van Veen, 1996).

**Machimus atricapillus**

This species is the only member of the genus occurring in the coastal dunes, although at very low abundance (Fig. 14). *M. atricapillus* shows the same distribution as *D. trigonus* and is common on open sandy soils, without specific habitat requirements (no reaction on vegetation height, amount of bare sand, presence of *Calluna vulgaris*). The sex-ratio was 0.74 (significantly different from one), indicating that we, contrary to van Veen (1996), caught more females with white pan- and pitfall traps. The species can be found from the end of July till the end of September with a peak in the last half of August (Fig. 15). Because of its preference for heathlands and dunes, we consider the species to be vulnerable in Flanders.
than the previous, with a peak in the second half of August (Fig. 17).

**Neoitamus cyanurus**

During our surveys, we only found one male in a dry woodland (edges) in Moerbeke and three males and eight females in the wooded heathland of the E17-road verges in Waasmunster in the period half June-July (Fig. 19). This preference for dry deciduous woodlands on sandy soils is confirmed by Dutch data, presented by VAN DER GOOT (1985) and VAN VEEEN (1996). TOMASOVIC (1998) considers this species as common and stable in Belgium.

**Philonicus albiceps**

TOMASOVIC (1998) classifies this species as rather common and stable in Flanders. We found the species at nine places. In the coastal dunes, it is the dominant species (Fig. 20). The sex ratio mm/ff is 1.36, significantly different from one. The species has specific habitat requirements: its abundance increases with the amount of bare sand (Fig. 12), but it also needs a moderately high grassland vegetation (Fig. 18), indicating its preference for sandy soils with the presence of grass tussocks. Its phenology is also delayed in the coastal dunes (Fig. 21a,b), again indicating that lower temperatures slow down the larval development. Because of its preference for open (dynamic) sandy soils in Flanders, we consider the species as vulnerable in Flanders.
Conclusion

Rare species and vulnerability in Flanders

In this contribution we discuss the distribution and ecology of some Asilid flies, captured in sandy regions of Flanders. A total of 14 species were found. Of these, some extremely rare species were recaptured since a long period: Antipalus varipes, Asilus crabroniformis, Machimus arthriticus and Pamponerus germanicus.

Twelve species are highly characteristic for sandy soils and can in the future thus be considered as Red List species in Flanders because their habitat is rare. An intensive sampling campaign remains however necessary for the confirmation of their assumed Red List status. As mentioned before, four species are extremely rare in Flanders and show a strong declining trend (TOMASOVIC, 1998): A. varipes, A. crabroniformis, M. arthriticus and P. germanicus. For these species we propose the status of ‘critically endangered’. Dioctria oelandica and E. rufibarbis are more common than the former species, show a declining trend, but remain rare in Flanders. For these species, we propose the status of ‘endangered’. With the exception of Dioctria atricapilla and D. cothurnata, all the other discussed species are bound to sandy grounds, but can still be found in numerous sites in large numbers. Because of their habitat preference (and the rarity of that habitat: oligotrophic grasslands, dry deciduous woodlands on sandy soils, dunes) we propose them as ‘vulnerable’ in our region. The two mentioned Dioctria-species are common in widespread habitats and are probably not threatened in Flanders.

Detailed analysis of the habitat preference

Interesting is the significant reaction towards the amount of bare sandy soil of Lasiopogon cinctus and Philonicus albiceps. The latter species prefers sandy places with high vegetation tussocks, a typical habitat in the coastal dunes, where it is the only species reaching high abundances. L. cinctus appears to be a typical species of woodland edges on sandy soils, confirming the habitat categorisation of VAN VEEN (1996) and VAN DER GOOT (1985). Machimus cingulatus requires the same macrohabitat as M. atricapillus, but seems more sensitive to grass encroachment, since it prefers short vegetation.

Coastal versus inland dunes

In general, we can conclude that the Asilid fauna in the Flemish coastal dunes is poor. In comparison to the Netherlands, species like Antipalus varipes, Eutolmus rufibarbis, Lasiopogon cinctus, Asilus crabroniformis and Pamponerus germanicus are absent. VERLINDEN (1982) states that extinction events due to shrub encroachment without recolonisation probably lay at the basis of this low diversity since suitable habitat is largely present. This is in our opinion only a part of the explanation and probably only true for A. crabroniformis, from which old records are present from the coastal dunes. The retrieval of local farmers (and their cattle) after the Second World War has probably fastened this species’ extinction. The other species all prefer more forested dunes. Since this habitat was almost completely absent till the seventies, suitable habitat was historically absent, so species were never present. Now, dune forest has developed but the accompanying species have probably not been able to colonise these habitats because of their isolated distribution in inland dunes. The establishment of dune woodland should thus enhance the Asilid richness in the future, if colonization from source populations can occur.

The coastal climate can also influence the presence of Asilid flies, since certainly the phenology of the two common species is retarded with approximately one month, indicating lower temperatures during the larval development. This factor cannot influence the absence of the previous mentioned species, since they all occur in the Holland dunes (VAN VEEN, 1996), where the climate is even colder than along the Flemish coast.
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