Agricultural landscape simplification reduces natural pest control: a quantitative synthesis

Adrien Rusch^{*1,2}, Rebecca Chaplin-Kramer^{3,4}, Mary M. Gardiner⁵, Violetta Hawro⁶, John Holland⁷, Douglas Landis⁸, Carsten Thies⁹, Teja Tscharntke⁹, Wolfgang W. Weisser¹⁰, Camilla Winqvist¹¹, Megan Woltz¹², Riccardo Bommarco¹¹

1. INRA, ISVV, UMR1065 SAVE, F-33883 Villenave d'Ornon, France

2. Univ. Bordeaux, Bordeaux Sciences Agro, UMR 1065 SAVE, F-33175 Gradignan, France

3. Natural Capital Project, Woods Institute for the Environment, Stanford University, 371 Serra Mall, Stanford, CA 94305, USA

4. Department of Environmental Science, Policy & Management, 130 Mulford Hall, University of California, Berkeley, CA 94720, USA

5. The Ohio State University-OARDC, 1680 Madison Ave, Wooster, OH 44691, United State

6. Museum and Institute of Zoology, Polish Academy of Sciences, Warsaw, Poland

7. Game & Wildlife Conservation Trust, Fordingbridge, Hampshire, SP6 1EF, UK

8. Department of Entomology, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI 48824

9. Agroecology, Department of Crop Sciences, University of Göttingen, Grisebachstrasse 6, 37077 Göttingen, Germany

10. Technische Universität München, Terrestrial Ecology Research Group, Department of Ecology and Ecosystem Services, Center for Food and Life Sciences Weißenstephan, Hans-Carl-von-Carlowitz-Platz 2, D-85354 Freising, Germany.

11. Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences, Department of Ecology, 75007 Uppsala, Sweden

12. USDA ARS Horticultural Crops Research Unit, 3420 NW Orchard Ave. Corvallis, OR 97330

25 * Corresponding author: adrien.rusch@bordeaux.inra.fr

26

27 **Abstract**

28 Numerous studies show that landscape simplification reduces abundance and diversity of natural
29 enemies in agroecosystems, but its effect on natural pest control remains poorly quantified. Further,
30 natural enemy impacts on pest populations have usually been estimated for a limited number of taxa
31 and have not considered interactions among predator species. In a quantitative synthesis with data
32 collected from several cropping systems in Europe and North America, we analyzed how the level and
33 within-field spatial stability of natural pest control services was related to the simplification of the
34 surrounding landscape. **All studies used aphids as a model species and exclusion cages to measure**
35 **aphid pest control. Landscape simplification was quantified by the proportion of cultivated land within**
36 **a 1 km radius around each plot.** We found a consistent negative effect of landscape simplification on
37 the level of natural pest control, despite interactions among enemies. Average level of pest control was
38 46 % lower in homogeneous landscapes dominated by cultivated land, as compared with more
39 complex landscapes. Landscape simplification did not affect the amount of positive or negative
40 interactions among ground-dwelling and vegetation-dwelling predators, or the within-field stability of
41 pest control. Our synthesis demonstrates that agricultural intensification through landscape
42 simplification has negative effects on the level of natural pest control with important implications for
43 management to maintain and enhance ecosystem services in agricultural landscapes. Specifically,
44 preserving and restoring semi-natural habitats emerges as a fundamental first step to maintain and
45 enhance pest control services provided by predatory arthropods to agriculture.

46

47 **Keywords:** crop protection, biological control, arthropods intraguild predation, ecosystem services,
48 landscape management, spatial stability

49

50

51

52 **1. Introduction**

53 Agricultural intensification since the mid-20th century has resulted in a loss of habitat heterogeneity
54 with important implications for biodiversity and ecosystem function within agricultural landscapes
55 (Benton et al., 2003). During this time, agricultural production increased in part by converting natural
56 and semi-natural habitats within agricultural landscapes into arable fields and partially replacing
57 ecological functions, originally provided by communities of beneficial organisms, with external fossil
58 and agrochemical inputs. But this has come at the cost of negative impacts on water and soil, human
59 and ecosystem health, biodiversity (Tscharntke et al., 2005) and thereby possibly agricultural yields
60 (Ray et al., 2012). A healthy ecosystem and the organisms it contains underpin agricultural
61 productivity with ecosystem services such as crop pollination, pest control, and nutrient cycling
62 (Bommarco et al., 2013). To achieve food security and environmental well-being in the long term, we
63 need to better understand these ecosystem services and integrate their management into modern
64 productive and environmentally friendly crop production systems.

65

66 Control of crop pests by their natural enemies is an important ecosystem function that supports crop
67 production and provides agriculture with a valuable, but poorly quantified, ecosystem service (Landis
68 et al., 2008; Tschumi et al., 2015). Natural or semi-natural habitats, such as woodlands, field margins,
69 permanent grasslands, or hedgerows, are crucial habitats for natural enemies in the agricultural
70 landscape as they provide overwintering sites, refuge from disturbance, and alternative prey (Landis et
71 al., 2000; Tscharntke et al., 2007; Rusch et al., 2010). Two comprehensive reviews demonstrate that
72 landscape complexity, commonly defined as the amount of non-crop habitats in a landscape sector
73 surrounding the crop field, generally enhance the abundance and diversity of natural enemies across a
74 range of cropping systems and climatic conditions, but found little evidence for an effect of landscape

75 structure on pest abundance (Bianchi et al., 2006; Chaplin-Kramer et al., 2011). This suggests that the
76 positive response of natural enemies may not necessarily translate into more effective pest control
77 (Chaplin-Kramer et al., 2011). However, an important caveat is that relatively few studies have
78 estimated the impact of natural enemies on the growth, and hence actual suppression, of pest
79 populations along landscape complexity or intensification gradients. In the most recent comprehensive
80 synthesis, Chaplin-Kramer et al. (2011) listed only four estimations from three studies of impacts on
81 pest population growth along landscape gradients, and since then several more such studies have been
82 conducted.

83
84 In addition to influencing natural enemy abundance and diversity, landscape structure may also alter
85 natural enemy interactions and the stability of pest suppression (Martin et al., 2013; Rusch et al., 2013).
86 Most studies that have quantified natural enemy impacts on pests consider just one or perhaps a few
87 parasitoid or predator taxa (e.g. ground-dwelling beetles). There is a need for multi-taxa approaches
88 taking into account the response of each guild, as well as the overall net pest suppression resulting
89 from positive and negative interactions among guilds. It is, furthermore, poorly known how intraguild
90 interactions might vary with landscape simplification, and how this affects the direction and strength
91 of predator-prey interactions across landscapes.

92
93 Increasing the stability (i.e., the inverse of variability) of ecological functions over time and space is an
94 important motivation for the integration of ecosystem services management in mainstream crop
95 production systems (Balvanera et al., 2006; Garibaldi et al., 2011; Bommarco et al., 2013). Increased
96 number of service-providing species in a community increases the stability of ecosystem services such
97 as biomass production (Weigelt et al., 2008; Cardinale et al., 2012), and crop pollination (Garibaldi et
98 al., 2011). The diversity and community composition of natural enemies can also influence the
99 magnitude and stability of natural pest control, but the outcomes may vary. A higher diversity of

100 natural enemies has been shown to increase overall predation rates, and to stabilize pest control
101 through niche partitioning, facilitation, and a higher probability of having efficient predators included
102 in a species rich community (Letourneau et al., 2009; Cardinale et al., 2012). **For example, facilitation**
103 **has been reported between ladybeetles and carabids leading to higher aphid suppression (Losey and**
104 **Denno, 1998).** However, increasing predator diversity can also strengthen negative interactions among
105 predators, *e.g.* by intraguild predation and behavioral interference (Ives et al., 2005; Straub et al.,
106 2008). **Intraguild predation between birds and flying insects, for example, has been shown to constrain**
107 **pest control in complex landscapes (Martin et al., 2013).** Yet another possibility is that interactions
108 among predators in a species-rich community leave pest control unaffected due to minimal interaction
109 among predators, or because positive and negative interactions balance each other (Letourneau et al.,
110 2009). A majority of the studies examining the relationships between biodiversity and ecosystem
111 functioning address impacts on stability of functioning over time. How the stability of pest control
112 across space, and ecosystem services in general, might change with increased biodiversity has received
113 much less attention (Rusch et al., 2013). An analysis of how various predatory guilds affect pest
114 population growth in contrasting environmental settings could reveal the relative and combined role of
115 key components of diversity for functioning, and how this varies with land use (Martin et al., 2013).
116
117 We performed a quantitative synthesis of the growing field of study on natural pest control services in
118 agroecosystems to measure the effect of landscape simplification on the magnitude and stability of
119 natural pest control in Europe and North America. Using primary data from predator exclusion
120 experiments that include measures of pest aphid population growth, we investigated the effect of
121 landscape simplification on (i) the magnitude and the within-field stability of natural pest control, (ii)
122 pest control provided by different guilds of natural enemies, and (iii) impact of interactions among
123 guilds of natural enemies on pest population growth. **We predicted that increasing landscape**

124 simplification would reduce the magnitude and the within-field stability of natural pest control and
125 increase the level of negative interactions among guilds of natural enemies.

126

127 2. Material and Methods

128

129 2.1 Studies and datasets

130

131 Our synthesis is based on published and unpublished data from 15 studies (175 field sites) from five
132 countries and on four crops (Table 1). All data were from manipulative experiments where ground-
133 dwelling and vegetation-dwelling arthropod enemies were excluded from their phytophagous aphid
134 prey with cages and compared to an open treatment. The exclusion treatments differed among studies.
135 Some studies used two exclusion modalities (total exclusion vs. open treatment) whereas other studies
136 used four exclusion modalities (total exclusion, exclusion of vegetation-dwelling predators, exclusion
137 of ground-dwelling predators and open treatment) (Table 1). Experiments were generally performed in
138 insecticide free area except for some fields in Holland et al. (2012) and in Chaplin-Kramer et al., (2012)
139 where short persistence insecticide were used (see publications for more details). The duration of the
140 experiment as well as the number of replicates per field also varied among studies (Table 1). However,
141 all experiments quantified the magnitude of pest control exerted by all natural enemies, and in some
142 cases the respective impact of vegetation-dwelling and ground-dwelling predators, by comparing
143 growth rates of aphid populations between open and exclusion treatments.

144

145 Using regionally available digital land cover maps, we calculated the proportion of cultivated land (all
146 type of crops) in the 1 km radius around the centre of each crop field (Table 1). This measure
147 represents a relatively simple and robust parameter for characterizing landscape simplification
148 (Persson et al., 2010; Roschewitz et al., 2005; Rundlöf and Smith 2006) and is often correlated with
149 other indicators of complexity, such as habitat-type diversity (e.g., Roschewitz et al., 2005; Tscharncke

et al., 2005). Moreover, this measure can also be interpreted as a more general proxy for agricultural intensification, as it is often correlated with factors such as pesticide use at the field to landscape scale (Meehan et al., 2011). The 1 km spatial extent was selected because it has been identified as a relevant scale to understand trophic interactions and population dynamics for a range of organisms including natural enemies of crop pests (Thies and Tscharntke 1999; Thies et al., 2005). Land use information was provided by each author or data owner and included all crop and non-crop habitat types. Original data sources were either digitalization based on aerial imagery and field inspection or administrative data available at national scales.

158

159 2.2 Pest control

160

To calculate the mean level of natural pest control for each site, we measured the difference in growth rates of aphids between the total exclusion treatment and the open treatment for all 15 datasets. Because the initial numbers of aphids as well as the duration of the experiment differed markedly among sites and studies, we calculated the aphid population rate of increase r (expressed as aphid x aphid⁻¹ x day⁻¹) for each replicate of each experimental treatment,

$$166 \quad r = [\ln(N_t + 1) - \ln(N_0 + 1)]/t$$

where N_0 = initial number of aphids, N_t = number of aphids at time t and t = the duration of the experiment in days. This calculation allows for comparisons among sites and studies (McCallum 2000; Costamagna et al., 2007; Latham and Mills 2010). For each replicate at each site, the difference in the rate of increase (between the total exclusion treatment and the open treatment) reflects the net mortality of aphids. Based on our experimental design, this mortality is assumed to be mainly due to natural enemies. In addition, we analyzed the spatial variation in the level of aphid control exerted by all natural enemies per site using the coefficient of variation (CV) calculated by dividing the standard

deviation of the sample with its mean (Garibaldi et al., 2011). This allows us to explore how the within-field stability in pest control is affected by landscape simplification.

To distinguish between the magnitude of pest control provided by ground-dwelling predators alone, or by vegetation-dwelling predators alone, we used a subset of seven datasets where either ground-dwelling, or vegetation-dwelling predators were partially excluded. We calculated the differences in aphid growth rates between the total exclusion and partial exclusion treatments for each replicate at each site, and calculated the CV for each site.

Finally, to characterize interactions between ground-dwelling and vegetation-dwelling predators, we calculated the difference between the overall pest control exerted by all natural enemies (using the open and total exclusion treatments), and the sum of pest control by ground-dwelling predators only, and vegetation-dwelling predators only (using the partial exclusion, and total exclusion treatments respectively). A positive result, with a higher overall pest control than the additive effect of control exerted by ground-dwelling and vegetation-dwelling predators, indicates facilitation between ground-dwelling and vegetation-dwelling predators. For instance, higher predation rates of aphids by carabids were found in the presence of ladybeetles due to increased number of living aphids falling to the ground due to ladybeetle foraging (Losey and Denno, 1998). A negative result indicates that there are negative interactions among predators in the community, such as intraguild predation, or behavioral interactions. For instance, a recent study reported high levels of spider predation by carabids in winter wheat fields and clear evidence of prey choice (Davey et al., 2012).

2.3 Statistical Analyses

Linear mixed models were used to evaluate the effects of landscape simplification within a 1 km radius on several response variables: the mean level of overall natural pest control (calculated as the mean

200 difference in the rate of increase r between exclusion and open treatment per site) and its within-field
 201 stability (calculated as the CV per site), the mean level of natural pest control by vegetation-dwelling
 202 and ground-dwelling natural enemies and their within-field variability, and the type and amount of
 203 interactions between vegetation-dwelling and ground-dwelling predators. In each model, the
 204 proportion of cultivated land in a 1 km radius around the study site was included as a fixed effect. For
 205 each response variable, we fitted a random intercept and slope model which included datasets as a
 206 random effect and allowed each datasets to have a unique intercept and a unique slope. Dataset defined
 207 here a set of field experiments performed in a given location in a given year (see Table 1). The overall
 208 slope of the model represents a weighted average over studies, where the relative influence of a study
 209 increased with the precision of each studies' model fit and sample size. To quantify the variation
 210 among studies in the influence of the fixed landscape effect on each response variable, we estimated
 211 intercepts and slopes for each study (Qian et al., 2010). Normality and homoscedasticity assumptions
 212 were assessed using graphical tools and these assumptions were valid in all models. Statistical analyses
 213 were performed using the statistical program R, version 2.15 (R Development Core Team 2012) and
 214 the lme4 package (Bates et al., 2015).

215

216 3. Results

217

218 The mean level of natural pest control decreased linearly with the proportion of cultivated land in the
 219 surrounding landscape ($F_{1,157} = 9.77$, $P = 0.002$, Figure 1). A simplification of the landscape from 2%
 220 to 100% of cultivated land reduced the level of aphid control by about 46 % (Figure 1). Estimated
 221 slopes for individual studies were consistent with this pattern (Figure 1). The proportion of cultivated
 222 land in the 1 km radius did not affect the within-field spatial variation in the overall level of natural
 223 pest control ($F_{1,136} = 0.25$, $P = 0.61$) (Figure S1).

224

Analyses of a subset of seven datasets that used partial exclusion experiments revealed that the proportion of cultivated land in a 1 km radius did not affect aphid control by ground-dwelling predators ($F_{1,58} = 0.06$, $P = 0.79$), or vegetation-dwelling predators ($F_{1,58} = 0.0007$, $P = 0.97$). Similarly, the proportion of cultivated land in the 1 km radius did not affect the within-field spatial variation in aphid control resulting from ground-dwelling ($F_{1,58} = 1.42$, $P = 0.23$), or flying predators ($F_{1,58} = 0.87$, $P = 0.35$) (Figure S2 and S3).

We found both positive and negative interactions among predators (Figure 2). The proportion of cultivated land in the 1 km radius did not affect the level of interactions between ground-dwelling and vegetation-dwelling predators ($F_{1,58} = 0.65$, $P = 0.42$) suggesting little interaction among predators, or a balance between negative and positive interactions in the community. Estimated slopes for individual datasets were consistent with this pattern (Figure 2).

4. Discussion

Although it is well recognized that populations of natural enemies are strongly influenced by landscape context (Bianchi et al., 2006; Tscharrntke et al., 2007; Chaplin-Kramer et al., 2011), our study is the first quantitative analysis assessing the effect of landscape simplification on natural pest control and natural enemy interactions based on experimental exclusion approaches. We found a negative effect of landscape simplification within a 1 km radius on the magnitude of pest control by natural enemies, but detected no influence of landscape simplification on the within-field variability of pest control. The negative relationship between landscape simplification and overall natural pest control was consistent across crops and countries, suggesting that landscape simplification generally reduces top-down control. Our results complement recent findings where both generalist and specialist enemies responded positively to landscape complexity in terms of abundance and diversity (Chaplin-Kramer et

249 al., 2011). Thus, maintaining or increasing natural and semi-natural habitat in the landscape both
250 benefit natural enemies and lead to higher effective pest control.
251

252 While the positive effect of landscape simplification on natural pest control by some guilds, such as
253 parasitoids, has been previously suggested (Thies and Tscharntke 1999; Bianchi et al., 2005), these
254 results indicate that this relationship holds at the community level when examining the overall top-
255 down control resulting from the combined effects of all arthropod enemies on pest populations. **The**
256 **fact that a relative increase of cultivated land from 2% to 100% in the 1 km radius (based on combined**
257 **datasets) reduced the level of natural pest control by about 46 % suggests** that landscape is a major
258 determinant of pest control functioning and insect pest outbreaks in agriculture (Tscharntke et al., 2005;
259 Meehan et al., 2011). Factors leading to reduced natural pest control in simplified landscapes may
260 include the lower availability of alternative hosts or prey, and of overwintering habitats and refuges
261 from disturbance for natural enemies (Landis et al., 2000; Tscharntke et al., 2007, Schellhorn et al.,
262 2015). Moreover, other aspects of agricultural intensification that are correlated with landscape
263 structure, such as pesticide use, can add pressure on natural enemies and reduce pest control in
264 simplified landscapes (Meehan et al., 2011).
265

266 The hypothesis that more simple landscapes strengthen negative interactions among natural enemies
267 was not supported. There were similar occurrences of negative and positive interactions along the
268 landscape simplification gradients. Although simple landscapes generally support less diverse and
269 abundant communities of natural enemies (Chaplin-Kramer et al., 2011), this result suggests that
270 negative interactions between predators may also occur in species-poor communities. Further,
271 investigations will be needed to understand the relationships between predator community structure
272 and the occurrence and strength of negative interactions.
273

274 Surprisingly, landscape simplification did not affect the within-field variability in overall natural pest
275 control. Stability of ecosystem functions is thought to increase with species richness due to niche
276 complementarity, facilitation, or sampling effects (Hooper et al., 2005); a positive relationship that has
277 been found for a variety of ecosystem functions including biomass production, crop pollination, and
278 pest control (Garibaldi et al., 2011; Isbell et al., 2009; MacFadyen et al., 2011). Studies linking natural
279 enemy diversity to pest control services have focused on temporal stability, while spatial stability
280 remains largely unexplored although considerable spatial heterogeneity in terms of abundance of
281 natural enemies and their prey have been observed within fields (Holland et al., 2004; Winder et al.,
282 2005; MacFadyen et al., 2011). Because landscape complexity is known to enhance natural enemy
283 diversity and abundance, we expected to find a lower within-field stability (higher variability) in pest
284 control in simple compared with more complex landscapes. The lack of this relationship in our study
285 might be a result of the low number of within-field replicates and the limited duration of experiments
286 used to measure pest control (five to 14 days for CV in pest control). This time span might be
287 sufficient to detect landscape effect on pest control due to higher abundance of natural enemies, but too
288 short to detect complementarity effects emerging from species-rich assemblages.

290 We found an effect of the proportion of cultivated land on the level of natural pest control by all
291 natural enemies, but not on the level of pest control by ground-dwelling and vegetation-dwelling
292 predators alone. This may be due to the relative importance of natural enemy guilds varying among
293 regions (Thies et al., 2011) making general effects of landscape simplification on each guild difficult
294 to perceive. Moreover, the scale and the habitat characteristics affecting each guild might vary
295 considerably, making it more challenging to detect any effect of landscape simplification on a subset
296 of seven case studies.

298 The aim of this study was to synthesize the knowledge about the effect of landscape simplification on
299 natural pest control services. However, all the cage experiments used aphids as a model system

300 because they are major pest for numerous crops, have relatively low mobility during the growth phase,
301 and are known to be consumed by a variety of enemies (Schmidt et al., 2003; van Emden and
302 Harrington, 2007). To enable broader conclusions on effects of land use on natural pest control, future
303 experimental assessments need to consider additional predator and pest taxa with different functional
304 attributes and life cycle requirements. Moreover, the density of prey occurring in fields may be another
305 important determinant of the level of pest control, affecting the population dynamics of natural
306 enemies and the services they deliver (Costamagna et al., 2004; Rusch et al., 2015), and should be
307 taken into account in future study.

308
309 In conclusion, our analysis revealed that landscape simplification reduced levels of natural pest control
310 irrespective of positive or negative interactions among natural enemies. These findings affirm that
311 conserving natural habitat or re-diversifying agricultural landscapes using natural or semi-natural
312 habitats provides viable control of crop pests that can be further supported and complemented with
313 more directed measures (Schellhorn et al., 2015).

314

315 **Acknowledgements**

316 Funding was provided by the Swedish Research Council FORMAS to RB, and the European Science
317 Foundation to the AGRIPOPES-project to RB, CT, TT, and WWW. Studies conducted in the UK
318 formed part of the “Rebugging the system” project RES-225-25-0093 funded through the Research
319 Councils UK Rural Economy and Land Use programme. VH acknowledges support of the Polish
320 Ministry of Science and Higher Education. DL and MW acknowledge support from the USDA AFRI
321 Grant #2007-35302-18272, the NSF Long-Term Ecological Research Program, and MSU
322 AgBioResearch. TT was supported by DFG and BMBF and WWW was supported by DFG. AR
323 acknowledges support from the FRB (the French Foundation for Research on Biodiversity) and from
324 the cluster of Excellence COTE.

325

326 **References**

- 327 Balvanera, P., Pfisterer, A. B., Buchmann, N., He, J.-S., Nakashizuka, T., Raffaelli, D., Schmid, B.,
328 2006. Quantifying the evidence for biodiversity effects on ecosystem functioning and services.
329 Ecol. Lett. 9, 1146–1156.
- 330 Bates, D., Maechler, M., Bolker, B., Walker, S., 2015. Fitting Linear Mixed-Effects Models Using
331 lme4. J. Stat. Soft. 67, 1-48.
- 332 Benton, T.G., Vickery, J.A., Wilson, J.D., 2003. Farmland biodiversity: is habitat heterogeneity the
333 key? Trends Ecol. Evol. 18,182-188.
- 334 Bianchi, F.J.J.A., Booij, C.J.H., Tscharntke, T., 2006. Sustainable pest regulation in agricultural
335 landscapes: a review on landscape composition, biodiversity and natural pest control. Proc. R. Soc.
336 273, 1715–1727.
- 337 Bianchi, F.J.J.A., van Wingerden, W.K.R.E., Griffioen, A.J., van der Veen, M., van der Straten, M.J.J.,
338 Wegman, R.M.A., Meeuwsen, H.A.M., 2005. Landscape factors affecting the control of *Mamestra*
339 *brassicae* by the natural enemies in Brussels sprout. Agric. Ecosyst. Envir. 107, 145–150.
- 340 Bommarco, R., Kleijn, D., Potts, S. G., 2013. Ecological intensification: harnessing ecosystem services
341 for food security. Trends Ecol. Evol. 28, 230–238.
- 342 Cardinale, B.J., Duffy, J.E., Gonzalez, A., Hooper, D.U., Perrings, C., Venail, P., Narwani, A., Mace,
343 G.M., Tilman, D., Wardle, D.A., Kinzig, A.P., Daily, G.C., Loreau, M., Grace, J.B., Larigauderie,
344 A., Srivastava, D.S., Naeem, S., 2012. Biodiversity loss and its impact on humanity. Nature 486,
345 59–67.
- 346 Chaplin-Kramer, R., Kremen, C., 2012. Pest control experiments show benefits of complexity at
347 landscape and local scales. Ecol. Appl. 22, 1936–1948.
- 348 Chaplin-Kramer, R., O'Rourke, M.E., Blitzer, E.J., Kremen, C., 2011. A meta-analysis of crop pest
349 and natural enemy response to landscape complexity. Ecol. Lett. 14, 922–932.

350

351 Costamagna, A.C., Menalled, F.D., Landis, D.A., 2004. Host density influences parasitism of the
352 armyworm *Pseudaletia unipuncta* in agricultural landscapes. *Basic Appl. Ecol.* 5, 347–355.

353 Costamagna, A. C., Van Der Werf, W., Bianchi, F. J. J. A., Landis, D. A., 2007. An exponential
354 growth model with decreasing r captures bottom-up effects on the population growth of *Aphis*
355 *glycines* Matsumura (Hemiptera: Aphididae). *Agric. For. Entomol.* 9, 297–305.

356 Davey, J.S., Vaughan, I.P., Andrew King, R., Bell, J.R., Bohan, D.A., Bruford, M.W., Holland, J.M.,
357 Symondson, W.O.C., 2013. Intraguild predation in winter wheat: prey choice by a common epigeal
358 carabid consuming spiders. *J. Appl. Ecol.* 50, 271–279.

359 Emden, H. F. V., Harrington, R., 2007. *Aphids as Crop Pests*. CABI. Wallingford. ISBN
360 9780851998190

361 Gardiner, M.M., Landis, D.A., Gratton, C., DiFonzo, C.D., O’Neal, M., Chacon, J.M., Wayo, M.T.,
362 Schmidt, N.P., Mueller, E.E., Heimpel, G.E., 2009. Landscape diversity enhances biological control
363 of an introduced crop pest in the north-central USA. *Ecol. Appl.* 19, 143–154.

364 Garibaldi, L.A., Steffan-Dewenter, I., Kremen, C., Morales, J.M., Bommarco, R., Cunningham, S.A.,
365 Carvalheiro, L.G., Chacoff, N.P., Dudenhöffer, J.H., Greenleaf, S.S., Holzschuh, A., Isaacs, R.,
366 Krewenka, K., Mandelik, Y., Mayfield, M.M., Morandin, L.A., Potts, S.G., Ricketts, T.H.,
367 Szentgyörgyi, H., Viana, B.F., Westphal, C., Winfree, R., Klein, A.M., 2011. Stability of
368 pollination services decreases with isolation from natural areas despite honey bee visits *Ecol. Lett.*
369 14, 1062–1072.

370 Griffiths, G. J. K., Wilby, A., Crawley, M. J., Thomas, M.B., 2008. Density-dependent effects of
371 predator species-richness in diversity–function studies. *Ecology* 89, 2986–2993.

372 Holland, J.M., Oaten, H., Moreby, S., Birkett, T., Simper, J., Southway, S., Smith, B.M., 2012. Agri-
373 environment scheme enhancing ecosystem services: A demonstration of improved biological
374 control in cereal crops. *Agric. Ecosyst. Envir.* 155, 147–152.

375 Holland, J. M., Winder, L., Woolley, C., Alexander, C. J., Perry, J. N., 2004. The spatial dynamics of
376 crop and ground active predatory arthropods and their aphid prey in winter wheat. *Bull. Entomol.*
377 *Res.* 94, 419-431.

378 Isbell, F. I., Polley, H. W., Wilsey, B. J., 2009. Biodiversity, productivity and the temporal stability of
379 productivity: patterns and processes. *Ecol. Lett.* 12, 443–451.

380 Ives, A.R., Cardinale, B.J., Snyder, W.E., 2005. A synthesis of subdisciplines: predator–prey
381 interactions, and biodiversity and ecosystem functioning. *Ecol. Lett.* 8, 102–116.

382 Landis, D.A., Wratten, S.D., Gurr, G.M., 2000. Habitat Management to Conserve Natural Enemies of
383 Arthropod Pests in Agriculture. *Annu. Rev. Entomol.* 45, 175–201.

384 Landis, D.A., Gardiner, M.M., van der Werf, W., Swinton, S.M., 2008. Increasing corn for biofuel
385 production reduces biocontrol services in agricultural landscapes. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* 105,
386 20552–20557.

387 Latham, D. R., Mills, N. J., 2010. Quantifying aphid predation: the mealy plum aphid *Hyalopterus*
388 *pruni* in California as a case study. *J. Appl. Ecol.* 47, 200–208.

389 Letourneau, D.K., Jedlicka, J.A., Bothwell, S.G., Moreno, C.R., 2009. Effects of Natural Enemy
390 Biodiversity on the Suppression of Arthropod Herbivores in Terrestrial Ecosystems. *Annu. Rev.*
391 *Ecol. Evol. Syst.* 40, 573–592.

392 Losey, J.E., Denno, R.F., 1998. Positive predator–predator interactions: enhanced predation rates and
393 synergistic suppression of aphid populations. *Ecology* 79, 2143–2152.

394 Macfadyen, S., Craze, P.G., Polaszek, A., Achterberg, K. van, Memmott, J., 2011. Parasitoid diversity
395 reduces the variability in pest control services across time on farms. *Proc. R. Soc. B* rspb20102673.

396 Martin, E.A., Reineking, B., Seo, B., Steffan-Dewenter, I., 2013. Natural enemy interactions constrain
397 pest control in complex agricultural landscapes. *roc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* 110, 5534–5539.

398 McCallum, H., 2000. Population Parameters: Estimation for Ecological Models. Blackwell Science,
399 Oxford.

400 Meehan, T.D., Werling, B.P., Landis, D.A., Gratton, C., 2011. Agricultural landscape simplification
 401 and insecticide use in the Midwestern United States. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* 108, 11500–11505.

402 Persson, A.S., Olsson, O., Rundlöf, M., Smith, H.G., 2010. Land use intensity and landscape
 403 complexity—Analysis of landscape characteristics in an agricultural region in Southern Sweden.
 404 *Agric. Ecosyst. Envir.* 136, 169–176.

405 Qian, S. S., Cuffney, T. F., Alameddine, I., McMahon, G., Reckhow, K. H., 2010. On the application
 406 of multilevel modeling in environmental and ecological studies. *Ecology* 91, 355–361.

407 Ray, D.K., Ramankutty, N., Mueller, N.D., West, P.C., Foley, J.A., 2012. Recent patterns of crop yield
 408 growth and stagnation. *Nat. Comm.* 3, 1293.

409 Roschewitz, I., Thies, C., Tschardtke, T., 2005. Are landscape complexity and farm specialisation
 410 related to land-use intensity of annual crop fields? *Agric. Ecosyst. Envir.* 105, 87–99.

411 Rundlöf, M., Smith, H. G., 2006. The effect of organic farming on butterfly diversity depends on
 412 landscape context. *J. Appl. Ecol.* 43, 1121–1127.

413 Rusch, A., Valantin-Morison, M., Sarthou, J.P., Roger-Estrade, J.P., 2010. Biological control of insect
 414 pests in agroecosystems: effects of crop management, farming systems and semi-natural habitats at
 415 the landscape scale. A review. *Adv. Agron.* 109, 219–260.

416 Rusch, A., Bommarco, R., Jonsson, M., Smith, H.G., Ekbom, B., 2013. Flow and stability of natural
 417 pest control services depend on complexity and crop rotation at the landscape scale. *J. Appl. Ecol.*
 418 50, 345–354.

419 Rusch, A., Delbac, L., Muneret, L., Thiéry, D., 2015. Organic farming and host density affect
 420 parasitism rates of tortricid moths in vineyards. *Agric. Ecosyst. Envir.* 214, 46–53.

421 Schellhorn, N.A., Gagic, V., Bommarco, R., 2015. Time will tell: resource continuity bolsters
 422 ecosystem services. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* 30, 524–530.

423 Schmidt, M.H., Lauer, A., Purtauf, T., Thies, C., Schaefer, M., Tschardtke, T., 2003. Relative
 424 importance of predators and parasitoids for cereal aphid control. *Proc. R. Soc. B* 270, 1905–1909.

425 Straub, C.S., Finke, D.L., Snyder, W.E., 2008. Are the conservation of natural enemy biodiversity and
426 biological control compatible goals? *Biol. Contr.* 45, 225–237.

427 Thies, C., Tscharntke, T., 1999. Landscape structure and biological control in agroecosystems. *Science*
428 285, 893–895.

429 Thies, C., Roschewitz, I., Tscharntke, T., 2005. The landscape context of cereal aphid–parasitoid
430 interactions. *Proc. R. Soc. B* 272, 203 –210.

431 Thies, C., Haenke, S., Scherber, C., Bengtsson, J., Bommarco, R., Clement, L.W., Ceryngier, P.,
432 Dennis, C., Emmerson, M., Gagic, V., Hawro, V., Liira, J., Weisser, W.W., Winqvist, C.,
433 Tscharntke, T., 2011. The relationship between agricultural intensification and biological control:
434 experimental tests across Europe. *Ecol. Appl.* 21, 2187–2196.

435 Tscharntke, T., Klein, A.M., Kruess, A., Steffan-Dewenter, I., Thies, C., 2005. Landscape perspectives
436 on agricultural intensification and biodiversity – ecosystem service management. *Ecol. Lett.* 8, 857–
437 874.

438 Tscharntke, T., Bommarco, R., Clough, Y., Crist, T.O., Kleijn, D., Rand, T.A., Tylianakis, J.M.,
439 Nouhuys, S. van, Vidal, S., 2007. Conservation biological control and enemy diversity on a
440 landscape scale. *Biol. Contr.* 43, 294–309.

441 Tschumi, M., Albrecht, M., Entling, M.H., Jacot, K., 2015. High effectiveness of tailored flower strips
442 in reducing pests and crop plant damage. *Proc. R. Soc. B* 282, 20151369.

443 Winder, L., Alexander, C.J., Holland, J. M., Symondson, W.O.C., Perry, J. N., Woolley, C., 2005.
444 Predatory activity and spatial pattern: the response of generalist carabids to their aphid prey. *J.*
445 *Anim. Ecol.* 74, 443–454.

446 Winqvist, C. 2011. Biodiversity and biological control, effects of agricultural intensity at the farm and
447 landscape scale. Doctoral thesis No. 2011:40, SLU, Uppsala, Sweden.

448 Woltz, J.M., Isaacs, R., Landis, D.A., 2012. Landscape structure and habitat management differentially
449 influence insect natural enemies in an agricultural landscape. *Agric. Ecosyst. Envir.* 152, 40–49.

table

450 **Table 1:** Summary of the exclusion experiment studies for the quantitative synthesis on the effect of landscape simplification on natural pest
 451 control.

Study code	Crop	Prey species	Exclusion treatment: open & total exclusion	Exclusion treatment: open, partial & total exclusion	Duration of the experiment	Location	Number of fields	Replicates per field	Landscape gradient (range of % of cultivated land in 1 km radius)	References
Study 1a	<i>Brassica oleracea</i>	<i>Brevicoryne brassicae</i> (Linnaeus)	Yes	No	12 days	USA, California	9	3	02 - 94 %	Chaplin-Kramer and Kremen (2012)
Study 1b	<i>Brassica oleracea</i>	<i>Brevicoryne brassicae</i> (Linnaeus)	Yes	No	12 days	USA, California	10	2	02 - 94 %	Chaplin-Kramer and Kremen (2012)
Study 1c	<i>Brassica oleracea</i>	<i>Brevicoryne brassicae</i> (Linnaeus)	Yes	No	12 days	USA, California	10	2	02 - 94 %	Chaplin-Kramer and Kremen (2012)
Study 2	<i>Triticum aestivum</i>	<i>Sitobion avenae</i> (Fabricius), <i>Metopolophium dirhodum</i> (Walker), <i>Rhopalosiphum padi</i> (Linnaeus)	No	Yes	13 or 14 days	Germany, Göttingen	8	2	26 - 93 %	Thies et al., (2011)
Study 3a	<i>Triticum aestivum</i>	<i>Sitobion avenae</i> (Fabricius)	No	Yes	14 days	UK, Dorset and Hampshire	14	2	33 - 87 %	Holland et al., (2012)
Study 3b	<i>Triticum aestivum</i>	<i>Sitobion avenae</i> (Fabricius)	No	Yes	14 days	UK, Dorset and Hampshire	12	2	27 - 87 %	Holland et al., (2012)
Study 4	<i>Triticum aestivum</i>	<i>Sitobion avenae</i> (Fabricius), <i>Metopolophium dirhodum</i> (Walker), <i>Rhopalosiphum padi</i> (Linnaeus)	No	Yes	11 - 23 days	Germany, Jena	8	2	48 - 98 %	Thies et al., (2011)
Study 5	<i>Triticum aestivum</i>	<i>Sitobion avenae</i> (Fabricius), <i>Metopolophium dirhodum</i> (Walker), <i>Rhopalosiphum padi</i> (Linnaeus)	No	Yes	16 - 19 days	Poland	8	2	39 - 94 %	Thies et al., (2011)
Study 6	<i>Hordeum vulgare</i>	<i>Rhopalosiphum padi</i> (Linnaeus)	Yes	No	5 days	Sweden, Scania	31	4	14 - 88 %	Rusch et al., (2013) ; unpublished data
Study 7	<i>Hordeum vulgare</i>	<i>Sitobion avenae</i> (Fabricius), <i>Metopolophium dirhodum</i> (Walker), <i>Rhopalosiphum padi</i> (Linnaeus)	No	Yes	20 - 22 days	Sweden, Uppsala	8	2	56 -100 %	Thies et al., (2011)
Study 8	<i>Hordeum vulgare</i>	<i>Sitobion avenae</i> (Fabricius), <i>Metopolophium dirhodum</i> (Walker), <i>Rhopalosiphum padi</i> (Linnaeus)	No	Yes	21 - 27 days	Sweden, Scania	8	2	48 - 100 %	Winqvist C. unpublished data
Study 9a	<i>Glycine max</i>	<i>Aphis glycines</i> (Matsumura)	Yes	No	7 - 14 days	USA, Michigan	12	4	9 - 79 %	Woltz et al., (2012) ; unpublished data
Study 9b	<i>Glycine max</i>	<i>Aphis glycines</i> (Matsumura)	Yes	No	7 - 14 days	USA, Michigan	12	4	16 - 89 %	Woltz et al., (2012) ; unpublished data
Study 10a	<i>Glycine max</i>	<i>Aphis glycines</i> (Matsumura)	Yes	No	14 days	USA, Michigan, Wisconsin, Iowa, Minnesota	12	4	39 -92 %	Gardiner et al., (2009)
Study 10b	<i>Glycine max</i>	<i>Aphis glycines</i> (Matsumura)	Yes	No	14 days	USA, Michigan, Wisconsin, Iowa, Minnesota	13	4	32 - 97 %	Gardiner et al., (2009)

452
453

Figure legends

Figure 1: Mean level of overall natural pest control in relation to the proportion of cultivated land in a 1 km radius around fields. The level of pest control was measured by the difference in growth rates of aphids (r) between the total exclusion treatment and the open treatment per day (aphid $\times$ aphid⁻¹ $\times$ day⁻¹) (see text for details). On the left, each point represents a field site within a study and the line represents the overall regression estimated from the linear mixed effect model. On the right, each point represents the slope of the model for each study (grey) and overall mean slope for all models (black), resulting from the random intercept and slope model.

Figure 2: Magnitude and direction of interactions between ground-dwelling and vegetation-dwelling predators in relation to the proportion of cultivated land in a 1 km radius. On the left, each point is a field site within a study. On the right, points represent the slopes of models for each study (grey) and the overall mean (black), resulting from the random intercept and slope model. Interactions between the two functional groups were calculated as the difference between natural pest control exerted by all natural enemies, and the sum of natural control by ground-dwelling and vegetation-dwelling predators together. Positive values indicate facilitation between the two groups whereas negative values indicate negative interactions such as intraguild predation or behavioral interactions.

Figure1

Figure2