SINGLE-IMPACT FICHE LANDSCAPE FEATURES

IMPACT: PESTS AND DISEASES

Data extracted in May 2022

Note to the reader: This fiche summarises the impact of three landscape features (field margins, flower strips, and hedgerows¹) and landscape features in general (including hedgerows, field borders and lands taken out of production, considered together as percentage of natural area) on PESTS AND DISEASES. It is based on 5 peer-reviewed synthesis research papers², including from 35 to 121 individual studies.

1. WEIGHT OF THE EVIDENCE

CONSISTENCY OF THE IMPACT:

The effect on pest control differs among landscape features (see **Table 1**):

- <u>Landscape features in general</u> (hedgerows, field borders and lands taken out of production pooled together as percentage of natural area) have a positive effect on the abundance of natural enemies and disease control and no effect on the abundance, diversity, population growth of pests or plant damage compared to agricultural lands without or with lower percentage of semi-natural habitat features, according to 2 synthesis papers reviewed.
- <u>Field margins</u> have a positive effect on pests and diseases (i.e. decrease of pests and diseases) compared to cropland or grassland without field margins, according to the 2 synthesis papers reviewed.
- <u>Flower strips</u> have a positive effect on pests and diseases compared to cropland or grassland without flower strips, according to 1 synthesis paper reviewed.
- <u>Hedgerows</u> have differing effects on pests and diseases compared to cropland without hedgerows. 3 synthesis papers reported no effect while 2 reported a positive effects.

The 5 reviewed synthesis papers include data collected in Europe (see **Table 2**).

Table 1. Summary of effects. The numbers between parentheses indicate the number of synthesis papers with a quality score of at least 50%. Details on quality criteria can be found in the next section. One synthesis paper reported results for two landscape features.

| Impact | Intervention | Positive | Negative | No effect | Uncertain |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|----------|----------|-----------|-----------|
| | Landscape features in general | 2 (2) | 0 | 2 (2) | o |
| Decrease pests and diseases | Field margins | 2 (2) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Flower strips | 1 (1) | 0 | 0 | o |

¹ Described in the General Fiche.

² Research synthesis papers include a formal meta-analysis or systematic reviews with some quantitative results. Details can be found in the methodology section of the WIKI.

| Hedgerows | 2 (2) | 0 | 3 (3) | 0 |
|-----------|-------|---|-------|---|

QUALITY OF THE SYNTHESIS PAPERS: The quality score summarises 16 criteria assessing the quality of three main aspects of the synthesis papers: 1) the literature search strategy and studies selection; 2) the statistical analysis; 3) the potential bias. Details on quality criteria can be found in the methodology section of this WIKI.

2. IMPACTS

The main characteristics and results of the synthesis papers are summarised in **Table 2**. Summaries of the metaanalyses provide fuller information about the results reported in each synthesis paper, in particular about the modulation of effects by factors related to soil, climate and management practices.

Table 2. Main characteristics of the synthesis papers reporting impacts of landscape features on pests and diseases. The references are ordered chronologically with the most recent publication date first.

| Reference | Population | Scale | Num. papers | Intervention | Comparator | Metric | Conclusion | Quality score |
|---|--|--|----------------|---|--|---|---|---------------|
| Albrecht, M; Kleijn, D; Williams, NM; Tschumi, M; Blaauw, BR; Bommarco, R; Campbell, AJ; Dainese, M; Drummond, FA; Entling, MH; Ganser, D | Cropland | North Americ a, Europe , New Zeland | 35 | 1) Flower strips; 2) Hedgerows | No flower strips; 2) No Hedgerows | Natural pest control service | This synthesis demonstrates enhanced natural pest control services to crops adjacent flower strips plantings but not adjacent to hedgerows, across a broad suite of regions, cropping systems and types of flower strips studied. | 62% |
| Duarte, GT; Santos, PM; Cornelissen, TG; Ribeiro, MC; Paglia, AP 2018 | Terrestrial landscapes in rural, agricultural, mixed rural–urban or natural habitats regions | Global | 121 | High landscape complexity as percentage of natural area (landscape features in general) | Low landscape complexity (percentage of natural area) | 1) Natural enemies (natural enemy abundance, richness, diversity, and direct effects on pest reduction); 2) disease control (disease prevalence, host and vector abundances, infection levels); 3) pest response (pest abundance, richness, and damage) | The percentage of natural areas had positive effect on disease control and natural enemies, while it has no effect on the loss of pests' response. The meta-analyses reinforce the importance of considering landscape structure in assessing ecosystem services for management purposes and decision-making. | 81% |
| Van Vooren, L; Reubens, B; Broekx, S; De Frenne, P; Nelissen, V; Pardon, P; Verheyen, K | Arable crops | Global (tempe rate climate) | 60 | 1) Grass strips (field margins); 2) Hedgerows | 1) No grass strips; 2) No hedgerows | Predator density, predator diversity | Predator diversity and density are significantly higher and aphid density was reduced in the grass strips systems. Hedgerows increased predator diversity. | 75% |
| Shackelford, G; Steward, PR; Benton, TG; Kunin, WE; Potts, SG; Biesmeijer, JC; Sait, SM 2013 | Fields, orchards, and vineyards of food crops | Global | 46 | High compositiona I complexity (proximity or diversity of non-crop plants in margins of | Low compositiona I complexity | Abundance and richness of crop pest natural enemies | Some pollinators and natural enemies seem to have compatible responses to complexity, and it might be possible to manage | 81% |

| Reference | Population | Scale | Num. papers | Intervention | Comparator | Metric | Conclusion | Quality score |
|---|------------|--------|----------------|---|---|------------------------------|--|---------------|
| | | | | food crops) (field margins) | | | agroecosystems for the benefit of both. | |
| Chaplin- Kramer, R; O'Rourke, ME; Blitzer, EJ; Kremen, C 2011 | Farmlands | Global | 46 | 1) % natural habitats (landscape features in general); 2) Length woody edges (hedgerows) | No natural habitats; 2) No woody edges | Natural enemies; 2) Pests | The positive response of natural enemies does not necessarily translate into pest control, since pest abundances show no significant response to landscape complexity. | 81% |

3. KNOWLEDGE GAPS

Van Vooren et al., 2017 To quantify and predict pest control on agricultural parcels, a very comprehensive

analysis of both species' spatial distribution, mobility and lifecycle, at parcel and

landscape levels is necessary.

Shackelford et al., 2013 The authors identified the interactions between pollinators and natural enemies

and their interacting effects on crop productivity as knowledge gaps.