González-Duran, G., Gutiérrez-Cárdenas, P.D.A. & Escobar-Lasso, S. 2012. *Physalaemus pustulosus* (tungara frog). Diet. Herpetological Review 43: 124-125

PHYSALAEMUS PUSTULOSUS (Tungara Frog). **DIET**. *Physalaemus pustulosus* occurs in northern South America and throughout much of the lowland tropical forests of Middle America (Ryan 2010. *In* M. Breed and J. Moore [eds.], Encyclopedia of Animal Behavior, pp. 453–461. Academic Press, Oxford). Ryan (1985. The Túngara Frog: A Study in Sexual Selection and Communication. Univ. Chicago Press, Chicago, Illinois. 246 pp.) reported that *P. pustulosus* eats primarily termites, in addition to ants, mites, dipterans, and snails; although no detailed information exists on the food habits of this species. Herein we provide data on the diet of *P. pustulosus* from Reserva Rio Manso (5.666°N, 74.77416°W; ca. 220 m elev.), municipality of Norcasia, departament of Caldas, Colombia.

We examined the diet of *P. pustulosus* by stomach-flushing 78 individuals, sampled by GGD and SEL from 12–20 May 2010, between 1900 and 2200 h, around ponds in pasture lands. We identified each prey item to order or family, and measured the length and width of each item using manual calipers (to nearest 0.1 mm). We estimated prey volume using the formula for a prolate spheroid.

TABLE 1. Types of prey in the diet of *Physalaemus pustulosus* from Reserva Rio Manso, Norcasia, Caldas, Colombia. Volume in mm³.

Prey	Number (%)	Volume (%)	Frequency of occurrence
Arachnida			
Acari	102 (9.6)	13.2 (0.52)	15
Insecta			
Coleoptera			
Chrysomelidae	1 (0.1)	0.5 (0.02)	1
Melolonthidae	1 (0.1)	0.3 (0.01)	1
Mycetophagydae	e 2 (0.2)	7.0 (0.28)	2
Nitidulidae	1 (0.1)	0.1 (0.00)	1
Silvanidae	2 (0.2)	0.9 (0.03)	2
Staphylinidae	5 (0.5)	1.5 (0.06)	5
Trogossitidae	1 (0.1)		1
Diptera			
Chironomidae	1 (0.1)	0.1 (0.00)	1
Drosophilidae	6 (0.6)	6.4 (0.25)	4
Micropezidae	4 (0.4)	2.2 (0.09)	1
Psychodidae	11 (1.0)	2.7 (0.11)	11
Sphaeroceridae	64 (6.0)	3.6 (0.14)	3
Hemiptera			
Cicadellidae	1 (0.1)	0.4 (0.01)	1
Fulgoridae	2 (0.2)	0.4 (0.01)	2
Hymenoptera			
Diapriidae	1 (0.1)	0.1 (0.00)	1
Figitidae	1 (0.1)	0.1 (0.01)	1
Formicidae	199 (18.8)	38.7 (1.54)	34
Isoptera			
Termitidae	630 (59.4)	2432.1 (96.50)	22
Protura			
Dycirtomidae	16 (1.5)	0.6 (0.02)	6
Thysanoptera			
Thripidae	1 (0.1)	0.3 (0.01)	1
Larvae	3 (0.3)	0.7 (0.03)	2
Diplopoda	1 (0.1)	0.1 (0.00)	1
Chilopoda	4 (0.4)	2.9 (0.11)	2
Mollusca	1 (0.1)	5.6 (0.22)	1
TOTAL	1061	2520.3	

Of 78 individuals examined, 46 (58.9%) contained prey. These individuals ranged from 17.9–33.5 mm SVL (mean 26.01 \pm 3.2). The diet consisted mainly of arthropods although mollusks were also present (Table 1). Insects (seven orders and 19 families, and larvae) and mites were the most important prey. Termites were dominant in the diet, representing 59.4% of the total number and 96.5% of the volume. Ants were also important, but consumed in less proportion (18.8% and 1.54%, respectively). Other prey groups were not as evident, with values below 9.6% total number and below 0.52% volume).

Duellman (1978. Univ. Kansas Mus. Nat. Hist. Misc. Pub. 65:1–352), Parmelee (1999. Sci. Pap. Nat. Hist. Mus. Univ. Kansas 11:1–59), and Menéndez-Guerrero (2001. Ecología Trófica de la Comunidad de Anuros del Parque Nacional Yasuní en la Amazonía Ecuatoriana. Pont. Univ. Catol. Ecuador. 173 pp.) reported that other *Physalaemus* species, e.g., *P. freibergi* and *P. petersi*, consume a lot of termites, up to 99% both numerically and volumetrically, and very small quantities of other prey such as Coleoptera, Hymenoptera, Dermaptera, Hemiptera, and Arachnida.

Frogs in the genus *Physalaemus* has been reported as active foragers, usually feeding on small and aggregated prey (Rodrigues et al. 2004. Rev. Esp. Herpetol.18:19–28), and proposed as a termite specialist (Duellman 1978, *op. cit.*; Vitt and Caldwell 1994. J. Zool. [Lond.] 234:463–476). Because of the large quantities of termites found in this work, we suggest that *P. pustulosus* in this region could be considered a termite specialist, and that the low values exhibited for other prey items might be due to accidental ingestions (Rodrigues et al. 2004, *op. cit.*).

We are grateful to A. M. Jaramillo and J. H. Castaño for logistic help in the Reserva Privada Riomanso; F. Vallejo and M. Salgado helped identify the prey items. Funding for fieldwork was provided by the Universidad de Caldas at Manizales.

GUSTAVO GONZÁLEZ-DURAN (e-mail: gustavo.gonzalezdu@gmail. com), **PAUL DAVID ALFONSO GUTIÉRREZ-CÁRDENAS** (e-mail: pdgutierrez2@yahoo.com), and **SERGIO ESCOBAR LASSO** (e-mail: biosergiobike@ gmail.com), Grupo de Ecología y Diversidad de Anfibios y Reptiles (GE-DAR), Departamento de Ciencias Biológicas, Universidad de Caldas, Calle 65 # 26-10, A.A. 275, Manizales, Colombia.