THE SPIDER ASSEMBLAGE IN A DENDROFLORISTIC HOTSPOT FROM EASTERN URUGUAY
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ABSTRACT

In previous studies, Uruguay has been considered a biogeographical crossroads. Paso Centurión and Sierra de Ríos in eastern Uruguay were recently entered into the National System of Protected Areas. The landscape is characterized by a mosaic of different ecosystems located in one of the dendrofloristic hotspots proposed for the country. The spiders constitute a megadiverse group useful for the monitoring of natural environments. The aim of this study was to know the composition and structure of the spider fauna of this protected area. The sampling of spiders was carried out in two different environments (ravine and riparian forests) and three methods were used: ground vacuum, foliage beating and manual collection. A greater richness of spider families, species and guilds was recorded compared to previous studies in other protected areas from Uruguay. The two environments showed differences in taxonomic composition and species replacement. Araneidae, Theridiidae and Salticidae represented the families with the highest species richness. The family Symphytognathidae and 55 species are new records for the country. The finding of more southern records for several species confirm that the area is located in a border zone with other biogeographical units at regional level. This fact supports the crossroads condition for the country, provides key information for the management of the area and increases the number of priority spider species for conservation in Uruguay.
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RESUMEN

El ensamble de arañas en un hotspot dendroflorístico del este de Uruguay. Estudios recientes han considerado a Uruguay como una encrucijada biogeográfica. Paso Centurión y Sierra de Ríos en el este de Uruguay fue recientemente ingresado al Sistema Nacional de Áreas Protegidas. El paisaje está caracterizado por un mosaico de diferentes ecosistemas situado en uno de los hotspots dendroflorísticos propuestos para el país. Las arañas constituyen un grupo megadiverso que es útil para el control de los entornos naturales. El objetivo del estudio consistió en conocer la composición y estructura de la araneofauna de esta área protegida. El estudio se llevó a cabo en dos tipos de ambientes (bosque ribereño y bosque de quebrada) y se utilizaron tres métodos: aspirador de suelo, batido de follaje y recolección manual. Se registró una mayor riqueza de familias, especies y gremios de arañas en comparación con estudios previos en otras áreas protegidas de Uruguay. Los dos ambientes mostraron diferencias en la composición taxonómica y reemplazo de especies. Araneidae, Theridiidae y Salticidae fueron las familias con mayor riqueza específica. La familia Symphytognathidae y 55 especies son nuevos registros para el país. El hallazgo de registros más australes para varias especies confirma que esta área se encuentra en una zona límite con otras unidades biogeográficas a nivel regional. Esto refuerza el carácter de enclave biogeográfico para el país, aporta información relevante para el manejo del área y aumenta el número de especies prioritarias de arañas para la conservación en Uruguay.
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INTRODUCTION

Biodiversity is essential for maintaining life and ecological services of ecosystems. In recent centuries, the process of habitat fragmentation, pollution, invasive species and the substitution of natural areas by different land uses have increased the rate of species extinction and the ecological interactions involved, causing a loss of biodiversity worldwide...
These threats led to the need to establish natural protected areas for biota conservation (Le Saout et al., 2013). One of the important tools for conservation is to describe the biodiversity and the study of ecological communities to understand their role in ecosystems (Norris, 2012). The hotspots are priority areas for conservation, at local and regional scales, because they are characterized by high species richness, the presence of endemic, rare or threatened species, high functional diversity, a unique evolutionary history and biogeography unit (Myers, 2003; Cañadas et al., 2014; Marchese, 2015). The number of species has been the most common argument to apply in the conservation management of natural ecosystems, in particular plants to estimate endemism and vertebrates for comparison between areas. However, invertebrates have probably been poorly considered due to the scarcity of data (Marchese, 2015). Natural forests maintain a high floristic diversity and are key corridors for the gene flow of fauna and flora associated with these ecosystems (Dixo et al., 2009; Dardengo et al., 2016). Furthermore, the boundaries at which different biota converge are known as biogeographic crossroads. This confluence generates higher levels of alpha diversity and species replacement between environments or ecosystems (beta diversity), which is why they are considered priority areas of interest for conservation (Spector, 2002).

From a biogeographic point of view, Uruguay is included in the Pampean Province (Morrone, 2014) where grasslands are the most common landscape throughout the country. Grela (2004) established the first proposal of endemism and hotspots for the Uruguayan dendroflora and the connections with neighboring floristic biota in southern South America. He recognized four floristic hotspots in the country that reflect the influence of other biogeographic areas such as the Alto Paraná forest and the Chaco provinces. From this point of view, Uruguay constitutes a border zone between the temperate grasslands of the Pampas with different ecoregions (Olson et al., 2001) or provinces (Morrone, 2014) of subtropical forests. Thus, the Uruguayan biogeographic regionalization proposed by Grela (2004) provided a framework for focusing future efforts on establishing protected areas in the country. Simó et al. (2014) reported the Uruguayan opiliofauna areas based on modeling of distribution species. They postulated this country as a biogeographic crossroads for the confluence of species from the Pampas and Paraná forests in agreement with Grela proposal for dendroflora. In addition, Laborda et al. (2018) showed the important role played by the riparian forests of the islands of the Uruguay River as a biological corridor for spider species with Alto Paraná forest. These facts place Uruguay as an area of high interest in the conservation of natural environments in South America. In spite of the uniqueness of the dendroflora, only 4.5% of the territory (Toranza et al. 2019) is represented by different types of natural forests such as riparian, hillside and ravine forests, which maintain biogeographic connections on a regional scale. Unfortunately, less than 1% of Uruguayan landscapes are included in the country’s protected areas and, in addition, agricultural expansion and the loss of natural habitats for other productive activities have increased in recent decades (Brazeiro et al., 2020). It is therefore imperative to generate knowledge about biodiversity as tools for planning new areas that cover more ecosystems and the corridors that connect them.

Spiders constitute a megadiverse group with 48770 species described worldwide (WSC 2020). Studies in South American riparian forests showed that these environments have a great richness of spider species, where spider diversity or the richness of spider guilds could be affected by vegetation structure (Rodrigues & Mendonça, 2012; Rodrigues et al., 2014; Griotti et al., 2017). Therefore, the high richness of spider species and guilds in Uruguay is expected to be associated with high plant diversity such as the four floristic hotspots proposed by Grela (2004). Efforts to record the spider diversity in Uruguay have been carried out over the last two decades, focusing on unexplored or little-known regions (Simó et al., 2015, Laborda et al., 2018). One of these regions is the east of the country, where Grela (2004) proposed two floristic hotspots. The northernmost where a rapid spider assessment was conducted in the truncated hills range (Simó et al. 2015). In this study, the authors found a high richness of spider species and proposed that the hills are linked to northern ecosystems based on the presence of species from Alto Paraná forest and Araucaria forest. In the southernmost dendrofloristic hotspot, Paso Centurión and Sierra de Ríos were recently included in the National System of Protected Areas (SNAP, 2019). This area represents a mosaic of different ecosystems with high diversity and rare species (Grela, 2004; Brussa & Grela 2007; Brazeiro, 2015). Since knowledge about the spider fauna in this area is scarce, we conducted an assessment in order to study the spider community in one of the dendrofloristic hotspots from Uruguay as a baseline for the conservation management of the area.

MATERIAL AND METHODS

Study area

The study was carried out in Paso Centurión and Sierra de Ríos, in eastern Uruguay, near the border with Brazil (Fig. 1A). The area is located at the confluence of the Gondwananic Sedimentary Basin and Sierra del Este ecoregions (Brazeiro, 2015) and is connected to the Sul-Riograndense Planalto in
southern Brazil. It was considered one of the areas of eastern Uruguay with conservation priority based on that it was included in a dendrofloristic hotspot (Grela 2004) and because of the high species diversity in plants and vertebrates (Brazeiro, 2015) (Fig. 1B). The landscape is made up of three topographic units: 1) Highlands, which are characterized by hills with grasslands, shrublands and hillside forests, 2) Ravines, which are areas of steeply sloping terrain occupied by hillside forests, 3) Lowlands, with a predominance of plains with riparian forest along the rivers. The main productive activity in the area is extensive cattle raising and to a lesser extent crops, forestry, mineral production, wind energy and tourism (SNAP, 2019). For the study, we selected two sites: Paso Centurión (32°7′54.29″S; 53°44′5.24″W) characterized by flood plains and riparian forests associated with the Yaguarón River and Sierra de Ríos (32°11′0.79″S; 53°51′15.02″W) composed of hills with ravine forests and grasslands associated with rock formations.

**Sampling procedure**

Seasonal samplings were conducted in July (2016, winter), April (2017 and 2019, autumn) and November (2017, spring) in two different environments: riparian forests and ravine forests, each associated with grassland and rocky areas ecotones (Fig. 2). Three complementary collecting methods were used in each survey: ground vacuum for ground and herbaceous vegetation stratum, consisting of 20 daytime and 20 one-minute nighttime samples; manual collection, four one-hour daytime and four one-hour nighttime samples; and foliage beating consisting of 20 daytime samples, each represented by 15 hits on the tree vegetation collected in 1 m² of a white cloth. These methods are considered very effective in capturing spiders from foliage and soil (Coddington et al. 1996; Pérez-Miles et al. 1999; Adis 2002; Schmidt et al. 2006; Jorge et al., 2013). Juveniles and adults were identified at the family level in order to recognize functional guilds. Adults were identified for morphospecies as far as possible at the species level through the use of keys (Jocqué & Dippenaar-Schoeman, 2007; Grismado et al., 2014) and taxonomic reviews. Spider guilds were classified according to Cardoso et al. (2011). We collected under DINAMA scientific collecting permit No. 2020/14000/003764. The voucher specimens were deposited in the arachnological collection of Facultad de Ciencias, Universidad de la República, Uruguay. A map of the study area was elaborated using QGIS (2020).

**Statistics**

To test the statistical differences in taxonomic composition between the two surveyed sites, we conducted an ANOSIM test. In order to evaluate the contribution of the species to the similarity/dissimilarity
between the environments, we performed a SIMPER test. The statistics were calculated using PAST 4.03 software (Hammer et al., 2001).

RESULTS

We collected 2591 spiders, represented by 38 families, 127 genera and 252 species/morphospecies (Table 1). One family (Symphytognathidae), 30 genera and 55 species are new records for Uruguay (Figs. 3 and 4). Furthermore, 60% were juveniles, 25% adult females and 15% adult males. Almost all of the species recorded (72%) belong to seven families, Araneidae (18%), Theridiidae (17%), Salticidae (14%), Linyphiidae (8%), Lycosidae (6%), Thomisidae (5%) and Anyphaenidae (4%). The number of species recorded was higher in the riparian forest (S = 206) than in the ravine forest (S = 83). More than half of the species recorded belong to the guilds of Other Hunters (24%), Orb Web (23%), and Space Web (19%).

Species composition for the environments studied (ravines and riparian forest) were significantly different (ANOSIM test: Bray-Curtis index R=0.1054, p=0.0001; Morisita index R=0.1074, p=0.0001) (Fig. 5) and with a high degree of species replacement (Jaccard similarity index: 0.146825). According to the SIMPER test of comparison between environments, Faiditus plaumanni (Theridiidae) was the species that most contributed to the observed dissimilarity (5.3%). This species was found in both types of environments studied, but with greater abundance in the riparian forest. All other species have less than 5% of contribution.

DISCUSSION

The high number of new spider records for the country increased the knowledge of the Uruguayan spider fauna. In addition, the high species richness and endemism of this area confirmed Paso Centurión and Sierra de Ríos as a hotspot for the spiders in eastern Uruguay. The results indicate that this area has the highest spider species richness compared to other natural environments studied in the country (Simó et al., 1994; Costa et al., 2006; Simó et al., 2015; Laborda et al., 2018). The dendroflora is influenced by the southern limit of the Brazilian Atlantic Forest (Brussa & Grela, 2007) that constitutes the Paso Centurión and Sierra de Ríos as the biotic limit of this ecoregion with the Pampas, which provides additional interest for conservation. This is supported by several species of spiders found here (S = 46; 18%) where their presence represents the southernmost record. In addition, these species agree with six of the seven criteria proposed by Ghione et al. (2017) for considering arachnid species as a conservation priority in Uruguay. They are as follows: C1, species endemic to Uruguay; C2, species with few records in arachnological collections in the country; C3, species only present in threatened environments; C4, species only recorded in rare habitats in the country; C5, species in which Uruguay represents the southernmost record in its distribution area; C6, species with ecological uniqueness. This last criterion was assumed on the basis that these species are associated with subtropical forests that encroach on Uruguayan territory (Brussa & Grela, 2007). As a result of this study, 12 species of those indicated by
Table 1. Taxonomic list of spiders collected in Paso Centurión and Sierra de Ríos (protected area), indicating guilds and associated environments for each species. New records are indicated with an asterisk (*). Southernmost records are indicated with a superscript S (*). New species to be considered with conservation priority for Uruguay are indicated with a superscript NPC (NPC). Abbreviations: AH = Ambush Hunters; GH = Ground Hunters; OH = Other Hunters; OW = Orb Web; RF = Riparian Forest; SH = Sheet Hunters; ShW = Sheet Web; SpW = Space Web; SW = Sensing Web.

| Spiders                          | Guild | Environment |
|----------------------------------|-------|-------------|
| **Actinopodidae**                |       |             |
| Actinopus sp.                    |       |             |
| Amaurobiidae                     |       |             |
| Amaurobiidae sp.1               | ShW   | RF          |
| Amaurobiidae sp.2               | ShW   |             |
| Retiro nigrontatius Mello-Leitão, 1947* | ShW | RF/R |
| **Anyphaenidae**                 |       |             |
| Anyphaenidae sp.1               | OH    | RF          |
| Anyphaenidae sp.2               | OH    |             |
| Anyphaenidae sp.3               | OH    |             |
| Anyphaenidae sp.4               | OH    |             |
| Aysha borgmeyeri (Mello-Leitão, 1926)* | OH | RF/R |
| Aysha vacaria                   |       |             |
| Cyclosa morretes                |       |             |
| Micrathena nigrichelis          |       |             |
| Micrathena furcata              |       |             |
| Micrathena nigrichelis          |       |             |
| Micrathena furcata              |       |             |
| Micrathena furcata              |       |             |
| Micrathena nigrichelis          |       |             |
| Micrathenaficata                |       |             |
| Anyphaenida sp.                 |       |             |
| Anyphaenida sp.1               |       |             |
| Anyphaenida sp.2               |       |             |
| Anyphaenida sp.3               |       |             |
| Anyphaenida sp.4               |       |             |
| Aysha borgmeyeri (Mello-Leitão, 1926)* |     |             |
| Aysha vacaria                   |       |             |
| Cyclosa machadinho              |       |             |
| Micrathena nigrichelis          |       |             |
| Micrathena furcata              |       |             |
| Micrathena nigrichelis          |       |             |
| Micrathena furcata              |       |             |
| Micrathena nigrichelis          |       |             |
| Micrathenaficata                |       |             |
| Anyphaenida sp.                 |       |             |
| Anyphaenida sp.1               |       |             |
| Anyphaenida sp.2               |       |             |
| Anyphaenida sp.3               |       |             |
| Anyphaenida sp.4               |       |             |
| Aysha borgmeyeri (Mello-Leitão, 1926)* |     |             |
| Aysha vacaria                   |       |             |
| Cyclosa machadinho              |       |             |
| Micrathena nigrichelis          |       |             |
| Micrathena furcata              |       |             |
| Micrathena nigrichelis          |       |             |
| Micrathenaficata                |       |             |
| Anyphaenida sp.                 |       |             |
| Anyphaenida sp.1               |       |             |
| Anyphaenida sp.2               |       |             |
| Anyphaenida sp.3               |       |             |
| Anyphaenida sp.4               |       |             |
| Aysha borgmeyeri (Mello-Leitão, 1926)* |     |             |
| Aysha vacaria                   |       |             |
| Cyclosa machadinho              |       |             |
| Micrathena nigrichelis          |       |             |
| Micrathena furcata              |       |             |
| Micrathena nigrichelis          |       |             |
| Micrathenaficata                |       |             |
| Anyphaenida sp.                 |       |             |
| Anyphaenida sp.1               |       |             |
| Anyphaenida sp.2               |       |             |
| Anyphaenida sp.3               |       |             |
| Anyphaenida sp.4               |       |             |
| Aysha borgmeyeri (Mello-Leitão, 1926)* |     |             |
| Aysha vacaria                   |       |             |
| Cyclosa machadinho              |       |             |
| Micrathena nigrichelis          |       |             |
| Micrathena furcata              |       |             |
| Micrathena nigrichelis          |       |             |
| Micrathenaficata                |       |             |
| Anyphaenida sp.                 |       |             |
| Anyphaenida sp.1               |       |             |
Spider diversity of Paso Centurión y Sierra de Ríos

| Guild | Environment |
|-------|-------------|
| Linyphiidae sp.3 | ShH RF |
| Linyphiidae sp.4 | ShH R |
| Linyphiidae sp.5 | ShH RF |
| Linyphiidae sp.6 | ShH RF |
| Linyphiidae sp.7 | ShH RF |
| Linyphiidae sp.8 | ShH RF |
| Linyphiidae sp.9 | ShH RF |
| Linyphiidae sp.10 | ShH RF |
| Linyphiidae sp.11 | ShH R |
| Linyphiidae sp.12 | ShH RF/R |
| Linyphiidae sp.13 | ShH RF |
| Linyphiidae sp.14 | ShH RF |
| Linyphiidae sp.15 | ShH RF |
| Linyphiidae sp.16 | ShH RF |
| Scolecura cambra Rodrigues, 2005* | GH RF/R |
| Scolecura sp. | GH RF |
| Sphecozone ignigena (Keyserling, 1886) | GH R |
| Sphecozone sp. | GH R |

| Lycosidae |
|-----------|
| Agalenatea velox (Keyserling, 1891) | GH RF |
| Aglauchenis lagotis (Holmberg, 1878)* | GH RF |
| Aglauchenis oblongus (C. L. Koch, 1847)* | GH RF |
| Daktulophora uruguayensis Keyserling, 1877 | GH RF |
| Hogna guntam (Petrunkevitch, 1911)* | GH RF/R |
| Lobizon humilis (Mello-Leitão, 1944) | GH RF |
| Lycosa annhygrosanntha Lucas, 1836 | GH RF |
| Lycosa dolostomia (C. L. Koch, 1847) | GH RF/R |
| Lycosinae sp.1 | GH RF/R |
| Lycosinae sp.2 | GH RF |
| Lycosinae sp.3 | GH RF |
| Navira nagan Piacentini & Grismado, 2009 | GH R |
| Paratrochochina amica (Mello-Leitão, 1941)* | GH RF |
| Pavocosa gallopavo (Mello-Leitão, 1941) | GH RF |

| Mimetiidae |
|------------|
| Gelanius zonatus (C. L. Koch, 1845)* | S RF |
| Mimetus melanoleucus Mello-Leitão, 1929 | S R |

| Miturgidae |
|------------|
| Tenaciscus insularis (Lucas, 1857) | OH RF |

| Myrmeleontidae |
|----------------|
| Myrmeleontinae sp. | SpW R |
| Myrmeleontinae sp. | SpW RF |

| Oonopidae |
|-----------|
| Neotrops lorenae Grismado & Ramirez, 2013 | GH RF |
| Oonopidae sp. | GH RF |
| Oonopidae sp. | GH RF |

| Oxyopidae |
|-----------|
| Harmaetiaca cf. marmorata Simon, 1898 | OH RF |
| Dorea salticus Hentz, 1845 | OH RF |
| Palpimandia sp. | OH RF |

| Palpimanidae |
|--------------|
| Oxythops biraben Mello-Leitão, 1945* | S R |

| Pholcidae |
|-----------|
| Mesabolivar charura Machado, Laborda, Simó & Brescovit, 2013* | SpW RF/R |

| Ptychothoidae |
|---------------|
| Acanthogonathus tacuarensis (Pérez-Miles & Capocasale, 1982)* | Sw R |

| Salticidae |
|------------|
| Aphrapi formica Galiano, 1981 | OH RF/R |

| Asaphobelis physonychus Simon, 1902* |
|--------------------------------------|
| Breda bicruciata (Mello-Leitão, 1943) |
| Breda irrigis Mello-Leitão, 1944 |
| Chira aff. thyse Simon, 1902* |
| Colonus melanogaster (Mello-Leitão, 1917)* |
| Cotinus melanura Mello-Leitão, 1930* |
| Cotinus triscalata (Mello-Leitão, 1943) |
| Dendryphantes sp.1 |
| Dendryphantes sp.2 |
| Dendryphantes sp.3 |
| Dendryphantes sp.4 |
| Euophryni sp.1 |
| Euophryni sp.2 |
| Euophyris melanoleuca Mello-Leitão, 1944 |
| Gastronomicans cf. vigens |
| Megafreya sutrix (Holmberg, 1875) |
| Metaphidippus sp. * |
| Neoneilla lumbrica Galiano, 1988* |
| Neoneilla montana Galiano, 1988* |
| Neoneilla sp. |
| Philira micans (Simon, 1902)* |
| Pseudopilula pulcherrima Mello-Leitão, 1928* |
| Saphysis salitraformis (Simon, 1901) |
| Sarinda marccicy Piza, 1937 |
| Sumangustus hudsoni Galiano, 1996 |
| Tartamana affectuosa (Galiano, 1977) |
| Theriella galianoae Braul & Lese, 1996* |
| Titanatus andinus (Simon, 1900) |
| Tulignernella morenensis (Tullgren, 1905)* |
| Tulignernella muscica (Mello-Leitão, 1945)* |
| Tulignernella serrana Galiano, 1970 |
| Tulignernella sp. |
| Zygoballus sp. * |

| Scytodidae |
|------------|
| Scytodes globula Nicolet, 1849 |
| Segestriidae |
| Ariadna boesenbergi Keyserling, 1877 |
| Selenegeidae |
| Selenege sp.1 Perty, 1833 |
| Senoculidae |
| Senoculus purpureus (Simon, 1880)* |
| Sparassidae |
| Polybates salticus Mello-Leitão, 1941 |
| Polybates punctatus Mello-Leitão, 1944 |
| Polybates pythagoricus (Holmberg, 1875) |
| Polybates randus (Keyserling, 1880) |
| Symphytognathidae* |
| Anapistula sp. * |
| Tetragnathidae |
| Chrysoneta boracea Levi, 1986 |
| Leucapea volupis (Keyserling, 1893) |
| Leucapea sp. |
| Tetragnatha sp.1 |
| Tetragnatha sp.2 |

| Table 1. Cont. | Guild | Environment |
|----------------|-------|-------------|
| Asaphobelis physonychus Simon, 1902* | OH RF |
| Breda bicruciata (Mello-Leitão, 1943) | OH RF |
| Breda irrigis Mello-Leitão, 1944 | OH R |
| Chira aff. thyse Simon, 1902* | OH RF |
| Colonus melanogaster (Mello-Leitão, 1917)* | OH RF |
| Cotinus melanura Mello-Leitão, 1930* | OH RF |
| Cotinus triscalata (Mello-Leitão, 1943) | OH RF |
| Dendryphantes sp.1 | OH RF |
| Dendryphantes sp.2 | OH RF |
| Dendryphantes sp.3 | OH RF |
| Dendryphantes sp.4 | OH RF |
| Euophryni sp.1 | OH RF |
| Euophryni sp.2 | OH RF |
| Euophyris melanoleuca Mello-Leitão, 1944 | OH RF |
| Gastronomicans cf. vigens |
| Megafreya sutrix (Holmberg, 1875) | OH RF |
| Metaphidippus sp. * | OH RF |
| Neoneilla lumbrica Galiano, 1988* | OH RF |
| Neoneilla montana Galiano, 1988* | OH RF |
| Neoneilla sp. | OH RF |
| Philira micans (Simon, 1902)* | OH RF |
| Pseudopilula pulcherrima Mello-Leitão, 1928* | OH RF |
| Saphysis salitraformis (Simon, 1901) | OH RF |
| Sarinda marccicy Piza, 1937 | OH RF |
| Sumangustus hudsoni Galiano, 1996 | OH RF |
| Tartamana affectuosa (Galiano, 1977) | OH RF |
| Theriella galianoae Braul & Lese, 1996* | OH RF |
| Titanatus andinus (Simon, 1900) | OH R |
| Tulignernella morenensis (Tullgren, 1905)* | OH RF |
| Tulignernella muscica (Mello-Leitão, 1945)* | OH RF |
| Tulignernella serrana Galiano, 1970 | OH R |
| Tulignernella sp. | OH R |
| Zygoballus sp. * | OH RF |

| Scytodidae |
|-------------|
| Scytodes globula Nicolet, 1849 | OH RF/R |
| Segestriidae |
| Ariadna boesenbergi Keyserling, 1877 | Sw RF |
| Selenegeidae |
| Selenege sp.1 Perty, 1833 | AH RF |
| Senoculidae |
| Senoculus purpureus (Simon, 1880)* | OH RF |
| Sparassidae |
| Polybates salticus Mello-Leitão, 1941 | OH RF |
| Polybates punctatus Mello-Leitão, 1944 | OH RF |
| Polybates pythagoricus (Holmberg, 1875) | OH RF |
| Polybates randus (Keyserling, 1880) | OH R |
| Symphytognathidae* |
| Anapistula sp. * | OW R |
| Tetragnathidae |
| Chrysoneta boracea Levi, 1986 | OW RF/R |
| Leucapea volupis (Keyserling, 1893) | OW RF/R |
| Leucapea sp. | OW R |
| Tetragnatha sp.1 | OW RF |
| Tetragnatha sp.2 | OW RF |
Table 1. Cont.

| Theraphosidae                        | Guild | Environment |
|--------------------------------------|-------|-------------|
| Catumini parvum (Keyserling, 1878)   |       |             |

Theridiidae

* Achaearanea sp.                             SpW RF
* Anelosimus hisicus (Keyserling, 1884)       SnPC SpW RF
* Anelosimus sp.                              SpW RF
* Anelosimus vierae Agnarsson, 2012            SpW RF
* Argyrodes elevatus Taczanowski, 1873        SpW RF
* Argyrodes sp.                               SpW RF
* Ariamnes longissimus Keyserling, 1891        SpW RF
* Coleosoma acutiventer (Keyserling, 1884)     SpW RF
* Cryptachaeta altiventer (Keyserling, 1884)   SpW RF/R
* Cryptachaeta belulai (Keyserling, 1891)      SpW R
* Cryptachaeta ericae Rodrigues & Poeta, 2015 SpW RF/R
* Cryptachaeta sp.1                           SpW RF
* Cryptachaeta sp.2                           SpW RF
* Cryptachaeta sp.3                           SpW RF
* Cryptachaeta sp.4                           SpW RF
* Cryptachaeta sp.5                           SpW RF
* Dipoena granulata (Keyserling, 1886)         SpW RF/R
* Dipoena santacatarinae Levi, 1963           SpW RF
* Dipoena sp.1                               SpW RF
* Dipoena sp.2                               SpW RF
* Dipoena variabilis (Keyserling, 1886)        SpW RF/R
* Faiditus americanus (Taczanowski, 1874)     SpW RF/R
* Faiditus altius (Keyserling, 1891)          SpW RF/R
* Faiditus plauamani (Exline & Levi, 1962)    SpW RF/R
* Faiditus sicki (Exline & Levi, 1962)        SpW RF/R
* Faiditus sp.1                              SpW RF
* Faiditus sp.2                              SpW RF
* Guaranilha manharti Baert, 1984              SpW RF
* Rhomphaea brasiliensis Mello-Leitão, 1920    SpW RF/R
* Rhomphaea paradoxa (Taczanowski, 1873)       SpW RF
* Styposis selis Levi, 1964                   SpW RF
* Steatoda sp.                               SpW RF
* Tekellina sp.                              SpW RF
* Theridiidae sp.1                           SpW RF
* Theridiidae sp.2                           SpW RF

Theridiidae sp.3                            SpW RF
Theridiidae sp.4                            SpW RF
Theridiidae sp.5                            SpW RF
Theridion calcynatum Holmberg, 1876          SpW RF
Theridion sp.1                              SpW RF
Theridion sp.2                              SpW RF
Thymoites puer (Mello-Leitão, 1941)          SpW RF
Wamba crispus (Simon, 1885)                 SpW RF

Theridiosomatidae

Theridiosomatidae sp.1                      OW RF
Theridiosomatidae sp.2                      OW RF

Thomisidae

Epiphanus villosus Mello-Leitão, 1929        AH RF
Epiphus rubires Mello-Leitão, 1924           AH RF
Misumenops pallidus (Keyserling, 1880)       AH RF
Strophius albifasciatus Mello-Leitão, 1929   AH RF
Titidius sp.1                               AH RF
Titidius sp.2                               AH RF
Titidius sp.3                               AH RF
Titidius sp.4                               AH R
Titidius sp.5                               AH R
Tmarus ct. albitrons Piza, 1944              AH RF/R
Tmarus sp.1                                 AH RF
Tmarus sp.2                                 AH R

Trachelidae

Menio sp.1                                   GH RF
Menio sp.2                                   GH RF
Trachelidae sp.1                             GH RF
Trachelidae sp.2                             GH R
Trachelidae sp.3                             GH R
Trachelopachys keyserlingi (Roewer, 1951)    GH R

Treichaleidae

Paratrechalea ornata (Mello-Leitão, 1943)     S RF/R
Treichaleoides biocellata (Mello-Leitão, 1926) S R

Uloboridae

Coniferaster yasi Grisnado, 2004              OW RF
Miagrammopes guttatus Mello-Leitão, 1937     OW RF/R
Miagrammopes sp.                             OW RF
Uloborus elongatus Opell, 1982               OW RF/R
Uloborus sp.                                OW RF

Ghione et al. (2015) were found in the protected area and 46 new species were categorized here, thus increasing the number with conservation priority for Uruguay from 35 to 81 spider species.

The family Symphytognathidae was first registered in Uruguay. This family comprises very small spiders, mainly extended in the tropics, which build orb webs in the litter (Jocqué & Dippenaar-Schoeman, 2007). The genus Anapistula Gertsch, 1941 is represented in the Neotropical Region with nine species described. Some of them have been recorded for the Atlantic Forest in southern Brazil and the Yungas in Argentina (Rheims & Crescovit, 2003; Rubio & González, 2010). The species collected in Paso Centurión and Sierra de Ríos are not known; so they must be described.

Araneidae, Theridiidae and Salticidae showed high species richness at the family level. Araneidae include orb-web weavers, Theridiidae build three-dimensional webs, and Salticidae include jumping spiders that are foliage or ground stalking hunters (Cardoso et al., 2011). Representatives of these families are reported to be very abundant and diverse in the Atlantic Forest (Rodrigues et al., 2014; Rubio,
Fig. 3. New spider records of Paso Centurión and Sierra de Ríos I. A. Kaira altiventer (Araneidae). B. Mastophora catarina (Araneidae). C. Micrathena spitzi (Araneidae). D. Paraverrucosa heterocantha (Araneidae). E. Verrucosa meridionalis (Araneidae). F. Nops meridionalis (Caponiidae). G. Hogna gumia (Lycosidae). H. Selenops rapax (Selenopidae).
Fig. 4. New spider records of Paso Centurión and Sierra de Ríos II. A. *Asaphobelis physonychus* (Salticidae). B. *Cetinusa melanura* (Salticidae). C. *Philira micans* (Salticidae). D. *Pseudofluda pulcherrima* (Salticidae). E. *Senoculus purpureus* (Sanoculidae). F. *Ariamnes longissimus* (Theridiidae). G. *Epicadus rubripes* (Thomisidae). H. *Miagrammopes guttatus* (Uloboridae).
Fig. 5. Boxplot of ranked distance obtained in the ANOSIM test for the groups and between them. A. Bray-Curtis index R=0.1054, p=0.0001. B. Morisita index R=0.1074, p=0.0001. R = Ravine; RF = Riparian Forest.

Table 2. Relative abundance of spiders (%) and number of species (S) per guild in the two environments.

| Guild               | Riparian Forest | Ravine |
|---------------------|-----------------|--------|
| %                   | S               | %      | S     |
| Other Hunters       | 25              | 51     | 19    | 14    |
| Orb Weaver          | 24              | 50     | 34    | 25    |
| Ground Hunters      | 14              | 28     | 17    | 13    |
| Space Web           | 21              | 43     | 12    | 9     |
| Sheet Hunters       | 6               | 12     | 8     | 6     |
| Sheet Web           | 2               | 5      | 3     | 2     |
| Sensing Web         | 1               | 2      | 3     | 2     |
| Specialists         | 1               | 2      | 4     | 3     |
| Ambush Hunters      | 6               | 12     | 0     | 0     |

2016; Munévar et al. 2020). Oliveira et al. (2015), applying the analysis of the Geographic Interpolation of Endemism, delimited the areas of endemism of spider species for Brazil. Santos et al. (2017), using the Kernel density estimator, identified the areas of greatest richness for the family Araneidae in the Neotropical Region. Both studies reported areas of endemism and highest spider species richness in southern Brazil bordering eastern Uruguay. Considering the high spider species richness found in Paso Centurión and Sierra de Ríos, this protected area should probably be influenced by the terrestrial connections with these Brazilian hotspots. This topic should be tested in the future. Vegetation heterogeneity provides more microhabitats for webs building (Rodrigues et al., 2014; Rodrigues et al., 2016; Munévar et al. 2020).
In our study, spider guilds constituted a wide variety of strategies where orb-weavers were the richest. This is consistent with the high availability of shelters for the construction of their webs. In addition, the great abundance and diversity of weaver species explains the presence of several kleptoparasitic spiders (e.g. Argyrodes, Ariamnes and Faiditus), which live and feed on the webs of the larger spiders. In the specific case of Faiditus plaumanni, its greater abundance in the riparian forest could be explained by the presence of Trichonephila clavipes in the same environment, a large orb weaver indicated as a common host of this kleptoparasitic species (Exline & Levi, 1962).

Statistical analysis revealed that both forest types are different in terms of spider composition and the low contribution of species to this dissimilarity indicates that species are more equitably represented. In addition, species replacement between them revealed high beta diversity. For instance, conservation efforts in the area should take into account the conservation plans of the different forest types in which the high species richness and structure of spider community are located.

This study showed that biodiversity assessments in megadiverse groups such as spiders could provide important taxonomic and ecological data that represent tools for conservation management at local and regional scales in protected areas and their biogeographic connections. Future studies should focus on exploring at a regional scale the role of Paso Centurión and Sierra de Ríos as a link between Atlantic Forest ecoregions.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank the Comisión Sectorial de Investigación Científica (CSIC, PAIE Program 2016) for the financial support. We are deeply grateful to Bruno da Silva, Silvana Greco, Mariana Trillo and Rodrigo Postiglioni for their help in the field work. We thank Denise Rugo for her comments on the language review. We also thank two anonymous reviewers whose comments helped to improve the final version of the manuscript.

REFERENCES

Adis J. 2002. Recommended sampling techniques. In Arachnida and Myriapoda of Amazonia. Pensoft Publisher. Sofia: 555-576.

Brazeiro A. 2015: Eco-Regiones de Uruguay: Biodiversidad, Presiones y Conservación. Aportes a la Estrategia Nacional de Biodiversidad. Facultad de Ciencias, CIEDUR, VS-Uruguay, SZU. Montevideo. 122 pp.

Brazeiro A., Achkar, M., Toranza, C. & L. Bartesaghi. 2020. Agricultural expansion in Uruguayan grasslands and priority areas for vertebrate and woody plant conservation. Ecology and Society 25(1): 15. https://doi.org/10.5751/ES-11360-250115

Brussa C.A. & I. Grela. 2007. Flora arbórea del Uruguay. Con énfasis en las especies de Rivera y Tacuarembo. COFUSA. Rivera. 542 pp.

Cañadas E.M., Fenu, G., Peñas, J., Lorite, J., Mattana, E. & G. Bacchetta. 2014. Hotspots within hotspots: Endemic plant richness, environmental drivers, and implications for conservation. Biological Conservation, 170: 282-291. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2013.12.007.

Cardoso P., Pekár S., Jocqué R. & J.A. Coddington. 2011. Global Patterns of Guild Composition and Functional Diversity of Spiders. PloS ONE. 6(6): e21710. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0021710

Coddington J.A., Young, L.H. & F.A. Coyle. 1996. Estimating spider species richness in a southern Appalachian Cove hardwood forest. Journal of Arachnology, 24: 111-128.

Costa F.G., Simó, M. & A. Aisenberg. 2006. Composición y ecología de la fauna epígea de Marindia (Canelones, Uruguay), con especial énfasis en las arañas: un estudio de dos años con trampas de intercepción. In: Menafra R., Rodríguez Gallego L., Scarabino F. y D. Conde (Eds) Bases para la conservación y el manejo de la costa uruguaya, pp. 427-436. Vida Silvestre Uruguay. Montevideo. 688 pp.

Dardengo J.F.E., Rossi, A.A.B., Silva, B.M., Silva, I.V., Silva, C.J. & A.M. Sebbenn. 2016. Diversity and spatial genetic structure of a natural population of Theobroma speciosum (Malvaceae) in the Brazilian Amazon. Revista de Biología Tropical, 64(3):1091-1100. https://dx.doi.org/10.15517/rbt.v64i3.21461

Dixo M., Metzger, J.P., Morgante, J.S. & K.R. Zamudio. 2009. Habitat fragmentation reduces genetic diversity and connectivity among toad populations in the Brazilian Atlantic Coastal Forest. Biological Conservation, 142(8):1560-1569. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2008.11.016.

Ellis E.C., Klein Goldewijk, K., Siebert, S., Lightman, D. & N. Ramankutty. 2010. Anthropogenic transformation of the biomes, 1700 to 2000. Global Ecology and Biogeography, 19: 589-606. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1466-8238.2010.00518.x

Exline H. & H.W. Levi. 1982. American spiders of the genus Argyrodes (Araneae, Theridiidae). Bulletin of the Museum of Comparative Zoology 127: 75-204.
Rubio G.D. & A. González. 2010. The first Symphytognathidae (Arachnida: Araneae) from Argentina, with the description of a new species of *Anapistula* from the Yungas mountain rainforest. Revista Chilena de Historia Natural, 83: 243-247.

Santos A.J., Brescovit A.D., de Oliveira-Tomasi M., Russo P. & U. Oliveira. 2017. Curves, Maps and Hotspots: The Diversity and Distribution of Araneomorph Spiders in the Neotropics. In: Viera C., Gonzaga M. (eds) Behaviour and Ecology of Spiders. Springer, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-65717-2_1

Schmidt M.H., Clough Y., Schulz W., Westphalen A. & T. Tscharntke. 2006. Capture efficiency and preservation attributes of different fluids in pitfall traps. Journal of Arachnology, 34: 159-162.

SNAP 2019. Proceso de ingreso de Paso Centurión y Sierra de Ríos al Sistema Nacional de Áreas Naturales Protegidas. Disponible en: https://www.gub.uy/ministerio-vivienda-ordenamiento-territorial/sites/ministerio-vivienda-ordenamiento-territorial-medio-ambiente/files/documentos/publicaciones/Proyecto_ingreso_Centurión%282%29.pdf

Spector S. 2002. Biogeographic Crossroads as Priority Areas for Biodiversity Conservation. Conservation Biology, 16(6): 1480-1487. https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1523-1739.2002.00573.x

Simó M., Guerrero J.C., Giuliani L., Castellano I. & L.E. Acosta. 2014. A predictive modeling approach to test distributional uniformity of Uruguayan harvestmen (Arachnida: Opiliones). Zoological Studies, 53: 50. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40555-014-0050-2