



Fig. 1: view of area 1.



Fig. 2: view of area 2.



Fig. 3: view of area 3.

TABLE I  
Absolute and relative abundance of colonizing species in each area during the summer of 2008

Species		Area			Total
		1	2	3	
<i>Chrysomya albiceps</i>	n	294	306	36	636
	%	46.2	48.1	5.7	100
	$\bar{X}$	5.286 <sup>a,b</sup>	6.526 <sup>a</sup>	2.248 <sup>b</sup>	-
<i>Chrysomya megacephala</i>	n	586	899	132	1,617
	%	36.2	55.6	8.2	100
	$\bar{X}$	7.664 <sup>a,b</sup>	10.894 <sup>a</sup>	4.306 <sup>b</sup>	-
<i>Chrysomya putoria</i>	n	54	115	22	191
	%	28.3	60.2	11.5	100
	$\bar{X}$	2.328 <sup>a</sup>	3.798 <sup>a</sup>	1.946 <sup>a</sup>	-
<i>Hemilucilia segmentaria</i>	n	23	54	17	94
	%	24.5	57.5	18.0	100
	$\bar{X}$	1.772 <sup>b</sup>	2.954 <sup>a</sup>	1.726 <sup>b</sup>	-
<i>Lucilia eximia</i>	n	150	47	26	223
	%	67.2	21.1	11.7	100
	$\bar{X}$	4.450 <sup>a</sup>	2.598 <sup>a</sup>	2.114 <sup>a</sup>	-
<i>Ophyra aenescens</i>	n	439	1,389	134	1,962
	%	22.4	70.8	6.8	100
	$\bar{X}$	6.944 <sup>a,b</sup>	12.944 <sup>a</sup>	4.168 <sup>b</sup>	-
<i>Ophyra chalcogaster</i>	n	11	4	9	66
	%	16.7	69.7	13.6	100
	$\bar{X}$	1.246 <sup>b</sup>	1.398 <sup>b</sup>	2.804 <sup>a</sup>	-
<i>Synthesiomyia nudiseta</i>	n	141	114	27	282
	%	50	40.4	9.6	100
	$\bar{X}$	4.766 <sup>a</sup>	4.380 <sup>a</sup>	2.282 <sup>a</sup>	-
<i>Fannia pusio</i>	n	295	168	117	580
	%	50.9	28.9	20.2	100
	$\bar{X}$	6.632 <sup>a</sup>	5.206 <sup>a</sup>	4.378 <sup>a</sup>	-
<i>Peckia intermutans</i>	n	2	2	0	4
	%	50	50	0	100
	$\bar{X}$	0.914 <sup>a</sup>	0.914 <sup>a</sup>	0.710 <sup>a</sup>	-

*a, b*: averages for each species are not significantly different at 5% ( $p < 0.05$ ). The averages were compared using the Tukey test; n: absolute abundance of species; %: relative abundance of species;  $\bar{X}$ : average values.

TABLE II  
Absolute and relative abundance of colonizing species in each area during the winter of 2007

Species		Area			Total
		1	2	3	
<i>Chrysomya albiceps</i>	n	87	98	177	362
	%	24.0	27.1	48.9	100
	$\bar{X}$	3.220 <sup>a</sup>	3.316 <sup>a</sup>	4.204 <sup>a</sup>	-
<i>Chrysomya megacephala</i>	n	9	34	19	62
	%	14.6	54.8	30.6	100
	$\bar{X}$	1.290 <sup>a</sup>	2.168 <sup>a</sup>	1.688 <sup>a</sup>	-
<i>Chrysomya putoria</i>	n	2	7	4	13
	%	15.4	53.9	30.7	100
	$\bar{X}$	0.884 <sup>a</sup>	1.180 <sup>a</sup>	1.044 <sup>a</sup>	-
<i>Hemilucilia segmentaria</i>	n	12	18	26	56
	%	21.5	32.1	46.4	100
	$\bar{X}$	1.348 <sup>a</sup>	1.652 <sup>a</sup>	1.680 <sup>a</sup>	-
<i>Lucilia eximia</i>	n	7	54	130	191
	%	3.7	28.3	68.0	100
	$\bar{X}$	1.224 <sup>a</sup>	2.462 <sup>a</sup>	3.192 <sup>a</sup>	-
<i>Ophyra aenescens</i>	n	101	102	61	264
	%	38.3	38.6	23.1	100
	$\bar{X}$	3.576 <sup>a</sup>	3.688 <sup>a</sup>	2.732 <sup>a</sup>	-
<i>Ophyra chalcogaster</i>	n	37	35	25	97
	%	38.1	36.1	25.8	100
	$\bar{X}$	2.490 <sup>a</sup>	2.384 <sup>a</sup>	1.846 <sup>a</sup>	-
<i>Synthesiomyia nudiseta</i>	n	72	336	335	743
	%	9.7	45.2	45.1	100
	$\bar{X}$	3.168 <sup>a</sup>	5.824 <sup>a</sup>	5.892 <sup>a</sup>	-
<i>Fannia pusio</i>	n	688	1,441	405	2,534
	%	27.1	56.9	16.0	100
	$\bar{X}$	9.736 <sup>a,b</sup>	14.532 <sup>a</sup>	6.814 <sup>b</sup>	-
<i>Peckia intermutans</i>	n	4	7	2	13
	%	30.8	53.9	15.3	100
	$\bar{X}$	1.118 <sup>a</sup>	1.118 <sup>a</sup>	0.914 <sup>a</sup>	-

*a, b*: averages for each species are not significantly different at 5% ( $p < 0.05$ ). The averages were compared using the Tukey test; n: absolute abundance of species; %: relative abundance of species;  $\bar{X}$ : average values.