Effects of landscape spatio-temporal heterogeneity and of food web structure on biological control for pest regulation

Patrizia Zamberletti

Under the supervision of Julien Papaïx Thomas Opitz Edith Gabriel

2019-2020



Landscape complexity





Agricultural landscapes vary from structurally simple landscapes with one or two cropping systems to complex mosaics of diverse cultivated fields embedded in a **natural habitat** matrix. (Power, 2010)

Landscape complexity

as





Landscape heterogeneity



Increasing configurational heterogeneity (Fahrig et al. 2011)

However, the nexus among **agricultural landscape structure** and **the species trophic interactions** is not trivial:





(Rand 2006, Blitzer 2012, Tscharntke 2016)

Objectives:

 Couple landscape features and species traits to provide insights on biological control outcomes at landscape scale



Stochastic-mechanistic prey-predator dynamic model:

Global scale

 To assess how the lanscape structure is able to locally influence the pest spatio-temporal dynamic provding insigth on biological control



Local scale



















Effects:



Pest

Predator migration % Hedge % Crop AND Hedge % Crop AND Predator migration

% Crop % Hedge AND Predator migration

% Crop
% Hedge
Population growth
% Crop AND Hedge
% Crop AND Predator migration

Prey diffusion

Predator migration Predator predation % Hedge AND Predator migration



Species variable

Similar landscapes with the same number of pest outbreaks, but with different spatial distribution of pest density peaks



% crop = 98% % hedge = 0.22% Aggregation = 4.96 N treatments = 10 % crop = 98% % hedge = 0.35% Aggregation = 3.22 N treatments = 10





Pest treatment



Hedge

Method:



Point pattern as spatio-temporal point process



It is a collection **X** of pairs (s_i, t_i) , i = 1, ..., n

where s_i , t_i are the spatial location and time of occurrence associated with the *i*th event We identify the spatio-temporal point patterns:

- **x** pest inoculation locations
- pest peak locations

Spatio- temporal models in order to LOCALLY predict:



1) Number of pest density peak model $\lambda(s,t)$ -

 $\lambda(s,t) = \int \left(\begin{array}{cc} \text{Spatial} & \text{Spatio-temporal} & \text{Population dynamic} \\ \text{covariates} & \text{covariates} & \text{covariates} \\ \end{array} \right)$

2) Magnitude of pest density peak model $P_{max}(s,t) \bullet \rightarrow \bullet$

 $P_{max}(s,t) = \int \left\{ \begin{array}{cc} \text{Spatial} & \text{Spatio-temporal} & \text{Population dynamic} \\ \text{covariates} & \text{covariates} & \text{covariates} \end{array} \right\}$



These variables favour high number of pest peaks with elevated pest concentration.

- Presence of peaks in previuos time steps in the same position or in the sourroding ones.
 - An elevated number of pest introductions in the neighborings
 - Among two patches



1) Number of pest peaks at t

 \rightarrow



These variables favour high pest concentration value, but in a low number. This happen when pests are clustered and limited in space, so they cannot diffuse, or they have a fast dynamic.

- An elevated number of peaks in neighborings only at one previous time step is not enough to lead to a high peak number at T.
- In the **middle of the patch** where the inoculation take place.
 - Low % culture
- Hedge proportion at landscape scale can favour the max peak value since predator presence helps to keep pests just under the threshold, but if predators are missing in one spot pest increase rapidly and quickly reach a high density value.
 - The **speed of predator spillover from hedge** mostly impact the area close by the hedge.



These variables decrease the number of peaks and also the pest maximum value.

- Application of **pesticide treatments in same loactions or in close ones** at T-1
- The local presence of a high % of hedge in the buffer highligh a high predator presence in the local area that decrease pest peaks and their density value
- The **diffusion of predator** in culture negatively impact the pest dynamic
- A high pest diffusion favors diluition effect decreasing both peak value and peak number

- These variables leads to a high number of pest peaks, but not with an elevated pest value
- % of crop coverage that is natural pest habitat, so naturally favors pest peaks. However, those peaks are not characterised by a so high density due to the diluition effect.
- The crop aggregation contribute to cause pest spread phenomenon as said before.
- Cells among more than 3 patches usually host a high number of pest peaks due to high spillover. The maximum value of pest is negatively influenced since those cell are in the periphery of the patch.





Take home messages:

GLOBALLY:



- Landscape simplification is the main driver of pest population abundance causing the highest number of pesticide treatments;
- The presence of semi-natural stripes enhances predator presence. However, the main positive effect on predator density results from its ability of spillingover from hedge to crop field leading to an efficient biological control.
- Different biological control outcomes are obtained through the combination of both landscape and species trait variables.

Stochastic-mechanistic prey-predator dynamic model

Take home messages:

LOCALLY:



A well **connected hedge network** could locally reduce pest density and treatment, due to the presence of pest predators;

- Local high **number** of pest peaks (1) is favoured by high pest introduction at previous time steps and situation that are the most suitable for pest dynamics, while they are decreased by dilution effect and predator presence or when treatment are previously applied;
- Local high **magnitude** of pest (2) is favoured by pest introduction and situations that constrain pests in a limited area, pest fast dynamics, low predator presence.

Stochastic-mechanistic prey-predator dynamic model

Thank you for your attention!



The study region is partitioned into cells to capture the local temporal dynamic

by models that:

- 1) Count the **number** of pest peak \rightarrow
- 2) Consider the **magnitude** of pest peak $\bullet \rightarrow$



The study region is partitioned into cells to capture the local temporal dynamic

by models that:

- 1) Count the **number** of pest peak \rightarrow
- 2) Consider the **magnitude** of pest peak $\bullet \rightarrow$

t=0.4



pest peak locations

х

The study region is partitioned into cells to capture the local temporal dynamic

by models that:

- 1) Count the **number** of pest peak \rightarrow
- 2) Consider the **magnitude** of pest peak $\bullet \rightarrow$





- x pest inoculation locations
- pest peak locations

The study region is partitioned into cells to capture the local temporal dynamic

by models that:

- 1) Count the **number** of pest peak \rightarrow
- 2) Consider the **magnitude** of pest peak $\bullet \rightarrow$





- x pest inoculation locations
- pest peak locations

The study region is partitioned into cells to capture the local temporal dynamic

by models that:

- 1) Count the **number** of pest peak \rightarrow
- 2) Consider the **magnitude** of pest peak $\bullet \rightarrow$

t=0.7



- x pest inoculation locations
- pest peak locations

culture/hedge proportion within the landscape



Cell-patch intersections





SpatialSpatio-temporalPopulation dynamiccovariatescovariates30



- **Treatments** within the cell;
- **Considering pest** inoculations and treatments within the cell;
 - Considering treatments or inocultations within neighboring cells.

31







Predator diffusion and spillover from hedge

SpatialSpatio-temporalPopulation dynamiccovariatescovariates32



Predator population density









Landscape variable 34 Species variable

