

Final Evaluation Report

We ask all grant recipients to complete a project evaluation that helps us to gauge the success of your project. This must be sent in **MS Word and not PDF format**. We understand that projects often do not follow the predicted course but knowledge of your experiences is valuable to us and others who may be undertaking similar work – remember that negative experiences are just as valuable as positive ones if they help others to learn from them.

Please DO NOT fill in and submit this form until the project has been completed.

Complete the form in English. Note that the information may be edited before posting on our website.

Please email this report to jane@rufford.org.

Your Details	
Full Name	Marília Botelho da Silva Bomfim
Project Title	Carbon Stock of native trees in diferent mangements forest restoration
Application ID	41923-1
Date of this Report	December 2025

1. Indicate the level of achievement of the project's original objectives and include any relevant comments on factors affecting this.

Objective	Not achieved	Partially achieved	Fully achieved	Comments
Plot marking;			x	
Collection of biometric data;			x	
Data processing and analysis;			x	
Article drafting		x		The scientific article derived from this project is already in preparation. It forms part of my doctoral thesis, which I will defend in January. Following the defense, I will proceed with the submission of the manuscript to a scientific journal.

2. Describe the three most important outcomes of your project.

a) Forest Structure – DBH and Height Distribution Patterns

Structural analyses indicate that the study areas are in different successional stages, consistent with the specific restoration techniques employed: restoration techniques using seedlings (RCS) and induction (RCI). This distinction is clearly reflected in the DBH distribution patterns.

The RCI plots exhibited a wide distribution of diameter classes, revealing the coexistence of young individuals and larger trees. This is a key indicator of a more advanced successional stage, as a sustainable tree community requires a continuous distribution of individuals across diameter classes to ensure future stability and effective in situ conservation (SILVA et al.).

In contrast, the RCM plots showed an absence of large-diameter trees and a concentration of individuals in the 20-60 cm DBH classes, along with generally shorter heights. This suggests limitations in initial establishment, likely linked to the sites' degradation history. While planting seedlings overcomes the first barrier (seed

dispersal), subsequent seedling development is hindered by other limiting factors such as soil conditions and microclimate. These findings highlight the critical importance of edaphic conditions and past land-use history in early-stage restoration (Holl, 1999).

b) Biomass, Basal Area, and Carbon Dynamics

Regarding basal area and biomass, notable visual differences were observed between the two restoration techniques, although these patterns were not statistically significant in t-tests ($p > 0.05$). Nonetheless, they suggest ecologically relevant differences, as both metrics are direct indicators of the successional stage.

Based on the structural development patterns for Atlantic Forest secondary growth described by Piotto (2009), which show an increase in basal area from about $11.8 \text{ m}^2 \text{ ha}^{-1}$ in 10-year-old stands, to $25.3 \text{ m}^2 \text{ ha}^{-1}$ at 25 years, and $29.0 \text{ m}^2 \text{ ha}^{-1}$ at 40 years, our data align with distinct successional ages.

The RCM technique had a median basal area below $10 \text{ m}^2 \text{ ha}^{-1}$, consistent with young stands of approximately 10 years. In contrast, RCI showed a median close to $30 \text{ m}^2 \text{ ha}^{-1}$, similar to the expected values for 40-year-old stands. This strongly suggests that RCI areas approximate a more advanced structural stage, while RCM areas are in the initial stages of regeneration.

These structural differences translate directly into ecosystem service provision. The results indicate that the restoration technique significantly influences both the current carbon stock and the annual sequestration rate. Consequently, the RCI areas, with their greater basal area and biomass, not only represent a more advanced successional stage but also provide higher carbon stocks and more consistent carbon capture. This reflects a more advanced and sustained regeneration process, underpinned by the remaining vegetation. In contrast, the initial structural limitations of RCM areas suggest that this technique may not be as immediately efficient as RCI for landscape-scale carbon capture, highlighting the potential need for enrichment planting and adaptive management to enhance this function.

c) Floristic Composition

Botanical material was successfully collected from 1,621 individuals (RCI – 985; RCM – 636). A total of 1,263 individuals were identified (RCI – 753; RCM – 510), corresponding to 98 taxa at the species level, 161 morphospecies at the genus level, and 20 at the family level, distributed across 131 genera and 56 families (see ANNEX 1).

The most frequent botanical families in the RCM areas were Myrtaceae (86 individuals), with the most common genera being *Myrcia* (31), *Psidium* (25), and

Eugenia (18); Anacardiaceae (64), dominated by *Tapirira guianensis* (55); Apocynaceae (64), with *Himatanthus bracteatus* as the sole frequent genus; and Melastomataceae (52), primarily represented by *Miconia* (46).

In RCI areas, the most frequent families were Rubiaceae (50), with *Palicourea* (24) and *Ferdinandusa* (10) as key genera; Myrtaceae (48), with *Myrcia* (20); Violaceae (41), represented almost exclusively by *Paypayrola*; Burseraceae, with *Protium heptaphyllum* (12) and *P. aracouchini* (8); and Fabaceae (35), notably *Arapatiella psilophylla* (12) (see Appendix).

The ten most ecologically important genera, as indicated by the Importance Value Index (IVI), were:

- RCI: *Protium*, *Thyrsodium*, *Clusia*, *Miconia*, *Emmotum*, *Ocotea*, *Guapira*, *Tapirira*, *Viola*, *Chrysophyllum*.
- RCM: *Dialium*, *Eschweilera*, *Eugenia*, *Hydrochorea*, *Byrsonima*, *Ficus*, *Tabebuia*, *Ceiba*, *Joannesia*, *Miconia*.

Correspondingly, the ten species with the highest IVI were:

- RCI: *Thyrsodium spruceanum*, *Clusia* sp1, *Protium heptaphyllum*, *Emmotum nitens*, *Tapirira guianensis*, *Vismia* sp3, *Chrysophyllum splendens*, *Agonandra* sp1, *Syagrus botryophora*.
- RCM: *Dialium guianense*, *Eschweilera ovata*, *Eugenia* sp3, *Hydrochorea pedicellaris*, *Byrsonima sericea*, *Ceiba speciosa*, *Joannesia princeps*, *Ficus* sp1, *Peltophorum dubium*, *Pourouma velutina*.

The floristic composition reflects the distinct starting points of each restoration approach. In RCI areas, the presence of pre-existing vegetation promoted a community dominated by species characteristic of more advanced successional stages (e.g., *Emmotum nitens*, *Chrysophyllum splendens*), with only one pioneer species (*Tapirira guianensis*) among the top ten. Conversely, RCM areas, established via direct planting on former pastureland, showed a greater prevalence of early-successional species, including three pioneers (*Byrsonima sericea*, *Joannesia princeps*, *Ceiba speciosa*) among the most important.

These distinct floristic patterns are directly associated with each area's land-use history and the type of intervention. The RCI technique, building upon remnant vegetation, enhances natural regeneration and fosters a more heterogeneous, diverse community. In contrast, the RCM floristic pattern is initially shaped by the specific species mix used in the total planting, which can lead to a higher concentration of individuals within a few selected families.

3. Explain any unforeseen difficulties that arose during the project and how these were tackled.

A primary logistical challenge was the taxonomic identification process. This work was conducted in collaboration with the herbarium at the Cocoa Research Center (CEPLAC/CEPEC) in Ilhéus, Bahia, where the Federal University of South Bahia (UFSB) is also located, which is in a different city from my residence (Porto Seguro, Bahia). Duplicate specimens were deposited there, and identification proceeded through comparison with reference material in collaboration with specialized researchers. The extensive botanical collection required periodic visits to the site, extending the overall analysis timeline. To mitigate this, the project schedule was adjusted to accommodate this essential phase without compromising scientific rigor.

Furthermore, on-the-ground data collection presented distinct challenges. Beyond delays caused by adverse weather and remote plot access, a key physical limitation was the collection of botanical material from very tall trees. Despite these hurdles, adaptive mitigation strategies enabled the successful execution of the core fieldwork and the subsequent identification process, safeguarding the integrity of the entire dataset

4. Describe the involvement of local communities and how they have benefited from the project.

The project actively engaged undergraduate students from the Federal University of Southern Bahia (UFSB) as part of the local field team, along with other professionals in the field. This collaboration provided valuable hands-on experience in forest restoration monitoring, biometric data collection, and botanical sampling techniques.

By participating in the project, these students and professionals gained: Practical skills in ecological fieldwork and scientific methodologies; Exposure to applied research on carbon stocks and biodiversity in restored forests; This initiative not only strengthened local expertise but includes contributed empowering a new generation of researchers and practitioners committed to forest management.

5. Are there any plans to continue this work?

Yes, as this research is part of my doctoral thesis, the goal is to finalize the study for publication in a scientific journal within the field. This will ensure the results are accessible to the broader scientific community and that the permanently marked plots can serve as a foundation for future research by other teams.

6. How do you plan to share the results of your work with others?

Results will be shared through a peer-reviewed journal article, presentations at conferences, and community workshops to disseminate findings to both academic and local stakeholders.

7. Looking ahead, what do you feel are the important next steps?

The next important step is the preparation and publication of a scientific article based on the findings of this project. The manuscript is currently being developed as part of my doctoral thesis, which I will defend in January/2026. Following the defense, the article will be finalized and submitted to a peer-reviewed scientific journal to ensure that the results are disseminated and accessible to the wider conservation community.

8. Did you use The Rufford Foundation logo in any materials produced in relation to this project? Did the Foundation receive any publicity during the course of your work?

Yes, The Rufford Foundation's support was formally acknowledged during my doctoral qualification presentation, where I presented this study as part of the second chapter of my thesis. At the time, I highlighted that the project had just received funding approval from the Foundation. This acknowledgment served as an important example of international support for scientific research in Brazil, demonstrating how critical funding organizations like The Rufford Foundation are for advancing ecological studies.

The Foundation's logo and support were properly cited in all academic presentations and materials related to this research phase, helping to increase visibility for both the project and the Foundation's role in promoting scientific development.

9. Provide a full list of all the members of your team and their role in the project.

All members listed served as field assistants. We managed a rotating field schedule, assigning available work slots to each team member on a daily basis.

- Edie Carvalho Ribeiro Ferraz – Field Assistant
- Ernesto Ramalho – Field Assistant
- Marina Araújo Costa Souza – Field Assistant
- Italo Viana dos Santos – Field Assistant
- Jackson Araújo dos Santos – Field Assistant
- Mailson Lourenço de Almeida – Field Assistant
- Bruno Severo Barros da Silva – Field Assistant

- Amanda Spiller – Field Assistant
- Matheus Oliveira Pitanga – Field Assistant
- Munique dos Santos Silva – Field Assistant
- Willy Silva Santos – Field Assistant
- Heyoan José Carrasco – Field Assistant
- Haislane Sena – Field Assistant

10. Any other comments?

This project has successfully established a robust foundation for advancing research on carbon stocks in restored forests. I am deeply grateful for the invaluable support provided by The Rufford Foundation, which has been instrumental in my progress. Moving forward, I am eager to build upon these findings and further contribute to the understanding and preservation of restored ecosystems.

ANNEX – Financial Report
[Intentionally removed]

APPENDIX

Floristic list showing the frequency of occurrence (number of individuals) of tree species sampled in the Restoration areas (RCI E RCM).

Família	Espécie	RCI	RCM	Família	Espécie	RCI	RCM
Achariaceae		1	0	Melastomataceae		15	52
	<i>Carpotroche brasilensis</i>	1	0		<i>Henriettea sp1</i>	0	6
Arecaceae		1	0		<i>Miconia sp1</i>	5	0
	<i>Areceae sp1</i>	1	0		<i>Miconia sp2</i>	3	0
Anacardiaceae		29	64		<i>Miconia sp3</i>	0	1
	<i>Anacardium occidentale</i>	0	3		<i>Miconia sp4</i>	0	19
	<i>Astronium concinnum</i>	0	2		<i>Miconia sp5</i>	4	2
	<i>Schinus terebinthifolius</i>	0	2		<i>Miconia sp6</i>	1	0
	<i>Spondias venulosa</i>	0	2		<i>Miconia sp7</i>	0	5
	<i>Tapirira guianensis</i>	9	55		<i>Miconia sp8</i>	2	10
	<i>Thyrsodium sprucianium</i>	20	0		<i>Miconia splendens</i>	0	9
Annonaceae		18	14	Meliaceae		10	1

	<i>Annona cacans</i>	1	0		<i>Cedrela odorata</i>	1	0
	<i>Guatteria oligocarpa</i>	7	0		<i>Guarea guidonia</i>	1	0
	<i>Guatteria sp1</i>	1	0		<i>Trichilia lepdota</i>	1	0
	<i>Guatteria sp2</i>	1	0		<i>Trichilia sp1</i>	2	0
	<i>Guatteria sp3</i>	1	0		<i>Trichilia sp2</i>	4	0
	<i>Rollinia bahiensis</i>	5	0		<i>Trichilia sp4</i>	0	1
	<i>Xylopia sericea</i>	2	14		<i>Trichilia sp5</i>	1	0
Apocynaceae		8	64	Moraceae		29	3
	<i>Aspidosperma sp1</i>	1	0		<i>Brosimum sp2</i>	2	0
	<i>Aspidosperma sp2</i>	1	0		<i>Brosimum sp3</i>	1	0
	<i>Aspidosperma spruceanum</i>	1	0		<i>Brosimum sp1</i>	1	0
	<i>Himatanthus bracteatus</i>	2	64		<i>Ficus sp1</i>	2	1
	<i>Macoubea sp1.</i>	1	0		<i>Ficus sp2</i>	3	0
	<i>Rawolfia sp1</i>	2	0		<i>Ficus sp3</i>	1	0

Aquifoliaceae		1	0		<i>Ficus sp4</i>	1	0
	<i>Ilex sp1</i>	1	0		<i>Ficus sp5</i>	1	0
Araliaceae		4	2		<i>Ficus sp6</i>	2	0
	<i>Dendropanax sp1</i>	1	0		<i>Ficus sp8</i>	1	0
	<i>Dendropanax sp2</i>	1	0		<i>Ficus sp9</i>	2	2
	<i>Didymopanax morototoni</i>	2	2		<i>Helicostylis tomentosa</i>	10	0
Arecaceae		13	0		<i>Sorocea sp2</i>	1	0
	<i>Attalea funifera</i>	1	0		<i>Sorocea sp3</i>	1	0
	<i>Syagrus botryophora</i>	12	0	Myristicaceae		7	0
Asteraceae		0	1		<i>Virola officinalis</i>	5	0
	<i>Baccharis sp1</i>	0	1		<i>Virola sp1</i>	2	0
Bignoniaceae		13	7	Myrtaceae		48	86
	<i>Bignonia sp1</i>	1	0		<i>Eugenia longifolia</i>	2	0
	<i>Fridericia sp1</i>	1	0		<i>Eugenia sp3</i>	0	18

	<i>Handroanthus sp1</i>	1	0		<i>Myrcia sp2</i>	3	0
	<i>Handroanthus sp2</i>	6	0		<i>Myrcia sp4</i>	0	1
	<i>Handroanthus sp3</i>	1	0		<i>Myrcia sp5</i>	5	0
	<i>Handroanthus sp4</i>	1	0		<i>Myrcia sp6</i>	3	0
	<i>Jacaranda sp1</i>	1	0		<i>Myrcia sp7</i>	3	0
	<i>Jacaranda sp2</i>	1	0		<i>Myrcia splendens</i>	0	31
	<i>Tabebuia sp1</i>	0	1		<i>Myrcia sylvatica</i>	6	2
	<i>Tabebuia sp2</i>	0	2		<i>Myrtaceae sp1</i>	3	0
	<i>Tabebuia sp3</i>	0	2		<i>Myrtaceae sp10</i>	1	0
	<i>Tabebuia sp4</i>	0	1		<i>Myrtaceae sp12</i>	2	0
	<i>Tabebuia sp5</i>	0	1		<i>Myrtaceae sp13</i>	1	0
Burseraceae		35	1		<i>Myrtaceae sp16</i>	1	0
	<i>Protium aracouchini</i>	8	0		<i>Myrtaceae sp17</i>	1	0
	<i>Protium catuaba</i>	3	0		<i>Myrtaceae sp2</i>	1	0

	<i>Protium heptaphyllum</i>	12	1		<i>Myrtaceae sp3</i>	0	1
	<i>Protium icariba</i>	4	0		<i>Myrtaceae sp4</i>	1	0
	<i>Protium sp1</i>	4	0		<i>Myrtaceae sp5</i>	1	0
	<i>Protium warmingianum</i>	4	0		<i>Myrtaceae sp6</i>	2	0
Calophyllaceae		1	0		<i>Myrtaceae sp7</i>	9	0
	<i>Kielmeyera sp1</i>	1	0		<i>Myrtaceae sp8</i>	1	6
Caricaceae		1	0		<i>Myrtaceae sp9</i>	1	0
	<i>Jacaratia spinosa</i>	1	0		<i>Psidium sp1</i>	0	2
Celastraceae		4	1		<i>Psidium sp2</i>	1	25
	<i>Chelioclinium cognatum</i>	1	0	Nyctaginaceae		26	1
	<i>Clethra scabra</i>	1	0		<i>Guapira oposita</i>	3	0
	<i>Maytenus sp1</i>	1	0		<i>Guapira sp1</i>	5	1
	<i>Maytenus sp2</i>	1	1		<i>Guapira sp2</i>	1	0
Chrysobalanaceae		16	0		<i>Guapira sp3</i>	6	0

	<i>Coupeia sp1</i>	5	0		<i>Guapira sp4</i>	5	0
	<i>Coupeia sp3</i>	1	0		<i>Guapira sp5</i>	2	0
	<i>Coupeia sp4</i>	4	0		<i>Guapira sp6</i>	1	0
	<i>Coupeia sp5</i>	1	0		<i>Neea sp1</i>	1	0
	<i>Coupeia sp6</i>	1	0		<i>Neea sp2</i>	1	0
	<i>Hirtella sp1</i>	2	0		<i>Neea sp3</i>	1	0
	<i>Hirtella sp2</i>	1	0	Opiliaceae		1	0
	<i>Licania sp1</i>	1	0		<i>Agonandra sp1</i>	1	0
Clusiaceae		28	5	Peraceae		26	6
	<i>Clusia sp1</i>	23	0		<i>Pera glabrata</i>	1	4
	<i>Clusia sp2</i>	1	0		<i>Pera sp1</i>	20	1
	<i>Garcinia sp1</i>	0	4		<i>Pera sp2</i>	0	1
	<i>Tovomita sp1</i>	3	0		<i>Pera sp3</i>	1	0
	<i>Tovomita sp2</i>	1	0		<i>Pogonophora</i>	4	0

					<i>schomburgkiana</i>		
	<i>Tovomita sp3</i>	0	1	Phyllantaceae		13	2
					<i>Amanoa guianensis</i>	9	1
Combretaceae		3	0		<i>Hyeronima sp1</i>	1	0
	<i>Terminalia sp1</i>	2	0		<i>Margaritaria nobilis</i>	3	0
	<i>Terminalia sp2</i>	1	0		<i>Picramnia sp</i>	0	1
Cordiaceae		10	5	Piperaceae		8	0
	<i>Cordia sp1</i>	0	2		<i>Piper sp1</i>	7	0
	<i>Cordia sp2</i>	4	0		<i>Piper sp2</i>	1	0
	<i>Cordia sp3</i>	2	2	Polygonaceae		2	2
	<i>Cordia sp4</i>	2	1		<i>Coccoloba sp1</i>	1	0
	<i>Varronia sp1</i>	2	0		<i>Coccoloba sp2</i>	1	0
Elaeocarpaceae		5	0		<i>Coccoloba sp3</i>	0	2
	<i>Sloanea sp2</i>	1	0	Primulaceae		0	10

	<i>Sloanea sp3</i>	1	0		<i>Myrsine coriaceae</i>	0	10
	<i>Slonea sp1</i>	1	0	Proteaceae		1	0
	<i>Slonea sp4</i>	1	0		<i>Pumus myrtifolia</i>	1	0
	<i>Slonea sp5</i>	1	0	Quiinaceae		1	0
Erythropalaceae		1	0		<i>Quiina glaziovii</i>	1	0
	<i>Heisteria sp1</i>	1	0	Rosaceae		1	0
Euphorbiaceae		12	6		<i>Roupala sp1</i>	1	0
	<i>Alchornea sp1</i>	1	0	Rubiaceae		50	25
	<i>Alchornea sp2</i>	9	0		<i>Amaioua intermedia</i>	1	0
	<i>Joannesia princeps</i>	0	6		<i>Amaioua sp1</i>	1	0
	<i>Sebastiania sp1</i>	2	0		<i>Cordia bahiensis</i>	1	0
Fabaceae		37	40		<i>Ferdinandusa edmundoi</i>	10	0
	<i>Amburana cearensis</i>	4	2		<i>Genipa infundibuliformis</i>	0	1
	<i>Andira nitida</i>	0	1		<i>Malanea martiana</i>	1	0

	<i>Andira sp1</i>	1	0		<i>Palicourea blanchetiana</i>	1	0
	<i>Andira sp2</i>	0	1		<i>Palicourea divaricata</i>	4	0
	<i>Andria anthelmia</i>	0	1		<i>Palicourea guianensis</i>	14	0
	<i>Arapatiela psitopylle</i>	12	0		<i>Palicourea sessilis</i>	4	0
	<i>Chamaecrista apoucouita</i>	1	0		<i>Palicourea sp1</i>	1	0
	<i>Dalbergia sp1</i>	0	1		<i>Psychotria pedunculosa</i>	3	0
	<i>Dalbergia sp2</i>	0	1		<i>Salzmannia nitida</i>	0	23
	<i>Dialium guianensis</i>	1	2		<i>Salzmannia plowmanii</i>	9	1
	<i>Dialium sp1</i>	3	0	Rutaceae		0	6
	<i>Diploporos ferruginea</i>	1	0		<i>Citrus sp1</i>	0	2
	<i>Diploporos sp2</i>	1	0		<i>Dictyoloma vandellianum</i>	0	1
	<i>Diploporos incexis</i>	1	0		<i>Zanthoxylum sp1</i>	0	3
	<i>Diploporos sp2</i>	1	0	Salicaceae		13	2
	<i>Fab sp1</i>	1	1		<i>Casearia arborea</i>	4	2

	<i>Fab sp2</i>	0	4		<i>Casearia commersoniana</i>	3	0
	<i>Hydrochorea pedicellaris</i>	0	6		<i>Casearia sp3</i>	1	0
	<i>Inga captata</i>	3	0		<i>Casearia sp4</i>	1	0
	<i>Inga edulis</i>	0	7		<i>Piparea multiflora</i>	4	0
	<i>Inga marginata</i>	1	0	Sapindaceae		7	5
	<i>Inga pleiogyna</i>	1	0		<i>Allophylus edulis</i>	1	0
	<i>Inga sp1</i>	1	0		<i>Cupania sp1</i>	0	1
	<i>Inga thibaudiana</i>	1	0		<i>Matayba grandis</i>	3	0
	<i>Libidibia ferrea</i>	0	1		<i>Matayba sp1</i>	0	1
	<i>Macrolobium latifolium</i>	1	1		<i>Matayba sp2</i>	1	1
	<i>Moldenhauera sp1</i>	1	0		<i>Sapindaceae sp1</i>	0	1
	<i>Peltogyne sp1</i>	0	1		<i>Sapindaceae sp2</i>	1	0
	<i>Peltophorum dubium</i>	0	10		<i>Sapindaceae sp3</i>	0	1
	<i>Tachigali densiflora</i>	1	0		<i>Talisia sp1</i>	1	0

Hypericaceae		3	10	Sapotaceae		20	0
	<i>Vismia sp1</i>	1	9		<i>Chrysophyllum sp1</i>	2	0
	<i>Vismia sp2</i>	0	1		<i>Chrysophyllum sp2</i>	2	0
	<i>Vismia sp3</i>	2	0		<i>Chrysophyllum splendens</i>	5	0
Icacinaceae		14	2		<i>Manilkara salzmannii</i>	1	0
	<i>Emmotum nitens</i>	14	2		<i>Micropholis sp1</i>	1	0
					<i>Pouteria butyrocarpa</i>	2	0
Lacistemataceae		3	0		<i>Pouteria nordestinensis</i>	1	0
	<i>Lacistema robustum</i>	3	0		<i>Pouteria reticulata</i>	1	0
Lauraceae		16	7		<i>Pouteria sp1</i>	2	0
	<i>Licaria sp1</i>	2	0		<i>Pouteria sp2</i>	2	0
	<i>Ocotea sp1</i>	5	0		<i>Pouteria sp4</i>	1	0
	<i>Ocotea sp2</i>	4	0	Simaroubaceae		1	1
	<i>Ocotea sp3</i>	1	3		<i>Homalolepis cedron</i>	1	1

	<i>Ocotea sp4</i>	0	1	Siparunaceae		2	0
	<i>Ocotea sp5</i>	2	0		<i>Siparuna sp1</i>	2	0
	<i>Ocotea sp6</i>	0	1				
	<i>Ocotea sp7</i>	1	2	Solanaceae		0	1
	<i>Ocotea sp9</i>	1	0		<i>Solanum sp1</i>	0	1
				Urticaceae		5	5
Lecythidaceae		11	14		<i>Pourouma velutina</i>	5	5
	<i>Cariniana estrellensis</i>	1	3				
	<i>Eschweilera ovata</i>	5	11	Verbenaceae		0	1
	<i>Lecythis lurida</i>	4	0		<i>Aloysia virgata</i>	0	1
	<i>Lecythis lanceolata</i>	1	0	Violaceae		41	0
Malpighiaceae		6	40		<i>Paypayrola sp1</i>	41	0
	<i>Byrsonima coccolobifolia</i>	1	0	Vochysiaceae		4	0
	<i>Byrsonima sericea</i>	3	40		<i>Qualea sp1</i>	1	0

	<i>Heteropteris sp1</i>	2	0		<i>Rinorea guianensis</i>	1	0
Malvaceae		5	10		<i>Rinorea sp1</i>	1	0
	<i>Ceiba speciosa</i>	0	4		<i>Rinorea sp2</i>	1	0
	<i>Eriotheca bahiensis</i>	1	3				
	<i>Eriotheca macrophylla</i>	2	0				
	<i>Luehea sp2</i>	0	3				
	<i>Luhea sp1</i>	1	0				
	<i>Pavonia sp1</i>	1	0				