

# Farmland Trees and Integrated Pest Management: A Review of Current Knowledge and Developing Strategies for Sustainable Systems

by Scott-Brown, A.S., Rial-Lovera, K., Giannitsopoulos, M.L., Rickson, R.J., Staton, T., Walters, K.F.A., and Burgess, P.J.

**Copyright, publisher and additional Information:** This is the author accepted manuscript. The final published version (version of record) is not yet available online via Research Information.

Please refer to any applicable terms of use of the publisher.



**Harper Adams  
University**

Scott-Brown, A.S., Rial-Lovera, K., Giannitsopoulos, M.L., Rickson, R.J., Staton, T., Walters, K.F.A., and Burgess, P.J. (2025) 'Farmland Trees and Integrated Pest Management: A Review of Current Knowledge and Developing Strategies for Sustainable Systems'. *Ecological Solutions and Evidence*.

**Farmland Trees and Integrated Pest Management: A Review of Current Knowledge and  
Developing Strategies for Sustainable Systems**

Scott-Brown A.S.<sup>1,2\*</sup>, Rial-Lovera K.<sup>3,4</sup>, Giannitsopoulos M.L.<sup>5,6</sup>, Rickson R.J.<sup>6</sup>, Staton, T.<sup>7</sup>, Walters K.F.A.<sup>8,9</sup>,  
Burgess P. J.<sup>6</sup>

1. Royal Botanic Gardens Kew, Richmond, Surrey, TW9 3AB, UK

2. University of Cambridge, Cambridgeshire, CB2 3EA, UK

3. Royal Agricultural University, Gloucestershire, GL7 6JS, UK

4. Nottingham Trent University, Nottinghamshire, NG25 0QF, UK

5. Rothamsted Research, Harpenden, Hertfordshire, AL5 2JQ, UK

6. Cranfield University, Bedfordshire, MK43 0AL, UK

7. University of Reading, Berkshire, RG6 6AH, UK

8. Imperial College London, Berkshire, SL5 7PY, UK

9. Harper Adams University, Shropshire, TF10 8NB, UK

\*Corresponding author: email: [a.scott-brown@kew.org](mailto:a.scott-brown@kew.org)

## Abstract

1. Climate change and the withdrawal of several classes of agrochemicals from use are intensifying the challenges faced by food producers of controlling pests in crop systems. Integrated Pest Management (IPM), which uses a combination of pest control approaches, is therefore a focus in international initiatives to improve the resilience of food production.
2. Integrating the greater use of trees and shrubs on farms within IPM frameworks offers a biodiversity-positive contribution to crop protection. For example, trees can modulate the prevalence and impacts of agricultural pests and their natural antagonists through direct and indirect interactions. The beneficial impact of farmland trees and shrubs on pest management in arable or grassland field can be enhanced from an analysis of variables such as tree species and their spatial distribution on farms, insect-plant dynamics, population behaviours, and soil management practices.
3. The aim of this study is to synthesise existing knowledge and to assess the benefits and trade-offs between farmland trees and IPM strategies, building on gaps in knowledge identified by a stakeholder survey. Through this targeted review, we delineate the future evidence required to define and quantify the advantages that farmland trees offer as an element of IPM strategies.
4. The development of regional biodiversity monitoring tools, which integrate landscape features such as trees, show promise for shaping national policies to increase adoption of IPM. There is a demand for user-friendly on-farm tools, adaptable to changing crop and pest priorities, that can support the alignment of the

54 management of farm trees with IPM. However, basic and applied biological and  
55 ecological research is needed to inform and validate these decision-support tools  
56 and the capability to inform landscape-scale models.

57

58 **Keywords:** Integrated Pest Management, natural enemies, farmland trees, conservation biological  
59 control, multifunctional landscapes, agroecology.

60

## 1. Introduction

Agricultural intensification, aimed at ensuring affordable, safe, and abundant food supplies, has been implicated in the decline of on-farm biodiversity and the disruption of essential ecosystem services such as pollination and natural pest control (Benton et al., 2003). The prolonged use of a limited range of conventional chemical pesticides has further exacerbated these issues by negatively impacting non-target species and increasing the risk of human exposure to these chemicals (Whelan et al., 2022). Integrated Pest Management (IPM) presents a sustainable alternative, emphasizing low-input, preventative approaches (Birch et al., 2011; Deguine et al., 2021; EPA, 2022). As defined by the European Commission's Sustainable Use of Pesticides Directive (Table 1; European Commission, 2009), IPM adheres to eight core principles applicable to arable cropping systems (Barzman et al., 2015). A fundamental aspect of IPM involves the protection and enhancement of beneficial organisms through the establishment of ecological infrastructures within and surrounding crop production areas (Gurr et al., 2017; Holland et al., 2016; Tscharncke et al., 2005). Additionally, IPM advocates for the preferential use of biological, physical, and other non-chemical methods over chemical interventions, where evidence suggests the former provide satisfactory pest control, or where significant pest suppression occurs leading to reduced use of conventional control application (Fig. 1).

**Table 1.** Definitions of integrated pest management, trees outside of woodland, farmland trees, native species, and natural enemies

Term	Definition
Invasive species and plant pest	<b>Invasive species</b> are those that are not native to the ecosystem under consideration and that cause or are likely to cause economic or environmental harm or harm to human, animal, or plant health (Beck et al., 2008). <b>Plant pests</b> include insects, other invertebrates, bacteria, fungi, viruses and other pathogens which affect the health of plants or plant products by feeding on them or causing disease (DEFRA, 2024b).
Integrated Pest Management (IPM)	<b>Integrated Pest Management</b> means careful consideration of all available plant protection methods and subsequent integration of appropriate measures that discourage the development of populations of harmful organisms and keep the use of plant protection products and other forms of intervention to levels that are economically and ecologically justified and reduce or minimise risks to human health and the environment. IPM

	emphasises the growth of a healthy crop with the least possible disruption to agro-ecosystems and encourages natural pest control mechanisms (European Commission, 2009).
Trees outside woodland	<b>Trees outside woodland</b> are trees that exist outside of woodland both in rural and urban areas. "Woodlands are defined as land with a minimum area of 0.5 ha under a stand of trees, and a tree crown cover of at least 20%, or the potential to reach this. The minimum width for a woodland is 20 m" (Brewer et al., 2017).
Farmland trees	<b>Farmland trees</b> are trees that are intentionally maintained or allowed to grow within agricultural landscapes. See Sinclair's (1999) framework for the classification of agroforestry practices which sets out the 'role of trees in agricultural landscapes'.
Native species	<b>Native species</b> have been defined as those which have occurred in an area continuously since the last glaciation, or have subsequently colonised naturally, although sometimes this can be difficult to demonstrate (Crees and Turvey, 2015).
Natural enemy	<b>Natural enemy</b> is a collective term for parasites, parasitoids, pathogens, predators, and competitors that inflict mortality on a population of a species. Arthropods (including insects, spiders, predatory mites and nematodes that parasitise insects) that are natural enemies of pests are termed <i>beneficials</i> (sources from Frank and Gillett-Kaufman, 2021).

81

82 Farmland trees and shrubs are perennial structures in agricultural landscapes which provide a range  
83 of ecological services delivered both spatially and temporally (Kuyah et al., 2016). For example, trees  
84 support beneficial arthropods including pollinators and natural enemies of crop pests, directly  
85 contributing to crop production and resilience (Kletty et al., 2023; Udawatta et al., 2019). Trees  
86 support beneficial species in temperate habitats by providing pollen and nectar early in the year  
87 when herbaceous flowering plants remain dormant, and additionally offer habitat niches and nesting  
88 sites all year round (Donkersley, 2019). Shelterbelts planted to protect crops from wind can provide  
89 additional refuges to beneficial arthropods and serve as barriers to insecticidal drifts from adjacent  
90 field crops (Holland et al., 2016; Longley & Sotherton, 1997; Ucar & Hall, 2001). For these reasons,  
91 farmland trees and shrubs can be considered as a component of conservation IPM planning. Young  
92 trees can provide immediate beneficial functionality that, if appropriately maintained, can continue  
93 throughout their life-span providing benefits for future generations (Pywell et al., 2005).




Figure 1. Physical, biological and chemical components of IPM, highlighting the role of the enhancement of beneficials and natural control (IBMA, 2021). Priority is given to actions at the base of the triangle, moving upwards, as necessary.

Within Europe, IPM principles and technologies have attracted increased interest because they can fill gaps created by the removal and restricted use of chemical controls, as well as complying with imposed legislation driven by new national agendas, policies and funding strategies (HSE, 2021). However some argue that the implementation of IPM remains limited and that the 2014 goals set by the Sustainable Use Directive (SUD) (see The Voluntary Initiative, 2024) have been missed. A key objective of the UK Government's 25-year Environment Plan and initiation of various incentive schemes that followed (DEFRA, 2024a; Gov.UK, 2018, 2023a) aimed to 'use resources from nature more sustainably and efficiently' and 'manage pressures on the environment by managing exposure to chemicals and enhancing biosecurity' (DEFRA, 2023a; Wentworth, 2023). Within the European Union, the EU Green Deal with integral Farm to Fork and Biodiversity initiatives (TEEB, 2018) have also raised the profile of IPM methodologies and the need for policies and funding to bring evidence-based IPM solutions into practice.

In this context, the broad question “Can farmland trees contribute to IPM strategies in agricultural landscapes?” formed the basis of our literature review. We invited 50 professionals working in areas of UK agriculture, forestry, conservation, plant health, and IPM to guide us in narrowing down the scope our literature review. We identified the key subject areas that were deemed highly relevant to our question and establish current views on what evidence and resources are needed to support knowledge exchange and promote the benefits of trees for contributions to IPM on arable farms.

## **2. Survey methods**

We used an online survey approach, adapting methods established for iterative voting processes in agricultural and science-policy (Ingram et al., 2013; Pretty et al., 2010; Sutherland et al., 2012) to circulate a list of suggested research questions aligned with our overarching theme of enquiry, IPM and farmland trees. The questions were divided into three themes: i) components (trees, pests, and beneficial invertebrates), ii) interactions between these components and management practices, and iii) monitoring, promotion, and regulation (Table 2). The survey was circulated to a group of 50 experts working in agriculture, forestry, conservation, plant health, and IPM, based in UK research organisations, government departments and advisory services. Individuals were selected based on their expertise on one or more of these areas and while ensuring a widespread of organisations were represented. The expert group was asked to rate each question on a five-point scale to indicate the sufficiency of existing information and the priority for further research and were encouraged to comment and include additional questions they felt were needed.

Responses were scored from a scale of 0 to 1, where 0 represented ‘no priority’ or ‘no information’, and 1 represented the highest availability of information or highest research priority. To rate the

“Existing knowledge” (Table 2, column 2), the number of responses per question were normalised to a scale from 0 to 1, with scores greater or equal to 0.75 signifying strong evidence, between 0.55 and 0.74 moderate evidence (or “Some”), between 0.25 and 0.54 weak evidence (or “Little”) and negligible evidence was associated with scores of less or equal to 0.24. The same grouping of normalised scores, was also applied to the “Priority for research” column, with values signifying “High priority” ( $1 < 0.75$ ), “Moderate priority” ( $0.74 < 0.55$ ), and “Low priority” ( $0.54 < 0.25$ ). Responses including ‘Do not know’ were removed from the analysis, but values are illustrated for clarity.

Survey participants received a preliminary report summarising the survey results, which initiated a second round in the consultation process, providing participants with the opportunity to again review and amend their initial responses, or pose additional questions based on the collective feedback circulated (Hsu & Sandford, 2007).

### **3. Survey results**

Of 50 stakeholders approached, 36% (18) participated in the initial survey poll. Among the respondents who confirmed the sector which most closely aligned to their area of expertise, 22% (8) were from research sectors, while others were aligned with policy (2), Industry (1) or conservation organisations (4). We analysed the participants survey responses using the scoring system defined in the methods section, to identify the themes this group perceived to be insufficiently studied (negligible or limited existing knowledge) and where there was a moderate to high priority for further research (Table 2).

A preliminary report summarising the survey results was circulated to the participant group, which included their comments, references and links to relevant open-access resources (SI.1). No further

additional comments were received from the survey participant group during the second round in the consultation process.

Table 2. Participants' responses (n=20) on the level of existing knowledge and prioritisation for research related to trees as a component of IPM strategies across farms in England and Wales

Survey Section	Survey questions	Existing knowledge	Do not know (%)	Priority for research/ action	Do not know (%)
<b>A.</b>	<b>IPM components: trees, pests, and beneficial invertebrates</b>				
A.1	Is information on the principal farmland trees and shrub species available?	Limited	13	Moderate	13
A.2	What are the main forms of the layout and management of farmland trees and shrubs?	Limited	14	Moderate	20
A.3	Which invertebrate groups are key economic pests of arable farms?	Some	0	Moderate	7
A.4	Which invertebrate groups are key economic pests of livestock farms?	Some	13	Low	7
A.5	Which invertebrates are natural enemies of pests?	Limited	13	<b>High</b>	7
<b>B.</b>	<b>Interactions between trees, pests, beneficial invertebrates, and management practice</b>				
B.1	Which species of trees and shrubs directly affect the diversity and abundance of pests?	Limited	8	Moderate	7
B.2	Which species of trees and shrubs directly affect the diversity and abundance of beneficial invertebrates?	Limited	13	<b>High</b>	7
B.3	How does layout and management affect diversity and abundance of pests?	Limited	20	Moderate	7
B.4	How does layout and management affect diversity and abundance of beneficial invertebrates?	Negligible	20	<b>High</b>	7
B.5	How does the distribution of beneficial invertebrate groups affect the importance of farmland trees for IPM	Negligible	47	Moderate	20
B.6	What local factors affect the association between farmland trees and economically important invertebrates?	Limited	29	Moderate	7
B.7	What key farm management actions affect invertebrate-tree relationships?	Limited	14	Moderate	7
<b>C.</b>	<b>Monitoring, promotion and regulation</b>				
C.1	Does a standard typology for IPM exist across research disciplines and industrial sectors?	Limited	33	Low	13
C.2	Do we know how to measure IPM benefits?	Limited	7	<b>High</b>	7
C.3	Do we know the best ways to promote farmland tree species and arrangements that provide IPM benefits?	Negligible	33	<b>High</b>	7
C.4	Do useable resources exist to guide the use of trees to promote IPM?	Negligible	33	<b>High</b>	13
C.5	Do farmer-led research or demonstration sites exist to test and explain the implications of farmland trees for IPM?	Limited	33	<b>High</b>	20

C.6	Do we understand how voluntary initiatives and government regulation can best be used to promote the use of trees to provide IPM on farms?	Limited	33	Moderate	13
-----	--	---------	----	----------	----

Participants' scores and comments were used to assign the questions into three sections illustrated in Fig. 2. and Table 2, and these were considered alongside published information to develop the background context, therefore incorporating views of the group of participants who responded. The first section addresses the component elements relevant to our overarching question, focusing on tree species and layout (Table 2, A.1 and A.2) and significant natural enemies of pests (Table 2, A.5). The second section examines the interactions between trees, pests, beneficial invertebrates, and management practices (Table 2, B1, B2, B3, B4, B5, B6, and B7). The final section explores questions related to monitoring, promotion, and regulation (Table 2, C2, C3, C4, C5, and C6).




Figure 2. Conceptual framework illustrating the three core topics in scope of this literature review - i) components (crops, invertebrates, and trees with their spatial arrangements), ii) interactions (how these components interact with management practices), and iii) opportunities (strategies for measurement, promotion, resource optimisation, research, demonstration and new initiatives).

#### 4. Discussion

## **4.1 Components: trees, pests, and beneficial invertebrates**

### **4.1.1 Farmland trees: distribution and composition**

Our survey highlighted that the distribution and composition of farmland trees are relevant to current investigations and limited knowledge exists (Table 2; A.1 and A2). Farmland trees can be classified as either Woodland Trees (WT) or Trees outside Woodlands (ToW) (Table 1). Hill et al. (2017) refined methods for estimating tree abundance and distribution within Great Britain's woodlands, utilising resources from the Sylva Foundation Suite (Sylva Foundation, 2023) and Oxford University Research Archive (Hill, 2016). The European Agroforestry Federation has also recently reviewed methods for classifying tree cover in Europe (Lawson et al., 2024).

More recently, Forest Research's Earth Observation for Trees and Woodlands (EOTW) project identifies tree canopy cover outside the National Forest Inventory. In England, trees outside woodlands have been mapped, showing that these trees make up nearly a third of nation's tree cover (Hunter et al., 2025). It categorizes trees (over 3 metres tall, covering an area of 5 metres<sup>2</sup>) into lone trees, groups of trees, and small woodlands, using lidar, Sentinel-2 imagery, and OS mapping. Brewer et al., (2017) reported that in England and Wales, such trees occupy an area of 658,000 ha or 28.5% of the total tree cover in 2016, comprising small woods (14.9%), groups of trees (9.8%), and lone trees (3.8%) (Figure 3). Regarding linear features, maps combined with LiDAR data collected between 2016 to 2021, estimate 390,000 km of hedgerows up to 6 m tall and 185,000 km above 6 m tall, the latter include mature hedgerow trees (UKCEH, 2024).




Figure 3. Farmland trees exist in a range of forms beyond woodland, as defined by the National Forest Inventory (NFI), including lone trees and hedgerow trees, linear groups, and small woods.

In Great Britain, resources such as the National Inventory of Trees in England and Wales (Forestry Commission, 2001, 2002) indicate that 93-95% of trees outside woodlands are broadleaf, with ash (*Fraxinus excelsior* L.) and oak (*Quercus robur* L.) being the most common species. Hawthorn (*Crataegus* spp.) and blackthorn (*Prunus spinosa* L.) dominate two-thirds of British hedges (Montgomery et al., 2020). In the past, comprehensive information on managing farmland trees and shrubs has been more limited. Carey et al. (2008) noted a 6% reduction in managed hedgerow length in Great Britain from 1998 to 2007, with many transforming into lines of trees and relict hedges.

#### 4.1.2 Arable invertebrate pests and natural enemies.

Trees on farms support IPM strategies by reducing pesticide drift (Ucar & Hall, 2001) and acting as sentinels in pest surveillance (Morales-Rodríguez et al., 2019; Way & Cammell, 1982). Here, we focus on their role in providing resources for invertebrate natural enemies that forage in adjacent crops (Iuliano & Gratton, 2020), in response to comments by survey participants who highlighted the need for a comprehensive information source of information on the interactions of pests and their natural enemies in arable systems (Table 2; A.5). The lack of information about natural enemies in arable

crops contrasts with horticultural crops, where decades of research have developed mass-reared predators and parasitoids. In orchard and fruit-growing sectors, native natural enemies are considered an integrated solution for pest control, though participants commented that their biology and interactions in these systems are still not fully understood.

Survey respondents reported some existing knowledge of invertebrate groups which are key economic pests (Table 2, A.3). A example includes a study by Lamichhane et al. (2017) which identifies common priority pests of field-grown crops, ranked by order of importance at European level. However, ongoing research is needed because pest control requirements may vary with new crops, arrival of new invasive species, or increasing threats from minor or endemic pests as climate and associated factors change in time (Mumford et al., 2017; Skendžić et al., 2021). Regional threats from pests and diseases are available online via national plant health risk registers and databases supported by national and regional plant health authorities (e.g. DEFRA, 2024c; EPPO, 2024; Ministry for Primary Industries, 2024; USDA APHIS, 2022). Additionally, long-term datasets, such as the Rothamsted Insect Survey (RIS, 2022), offer national resources for developing and testing models to forecast and evaluate pest management options under changing conditions (Redhead et al., 2020; Webb et al., 2023).

IPM solutions typically seek to complement crop pest control activities by promoting wild predatory and parasitic invertebrates present in cultivated landscapes (Daniels et al., 2017; Losey & Vaughan, 2006). Information on conservation biological control for pest suppression can be obtained via the BioProtection Portal, where users can seek details on biological control agents by entering pest location and cropping system (CABI, 2024a). With relevance to field-grown crops, the Agriculture and Horticulture Development Board's "Encyclopaedia of pests and natural enemies in field crops" provides efficacy data on specialist and generalist natural enemies (SI.2, AHDB, 2021). An IPM online

tool provide by the National Farmers' Union provides one of the few resources that support the development of IPM strategies tailored for use on arable and pasture farms (NFU, 2023). However, the economic benefits and trade-offs associated with practices to conserve and integrate natural enemies into crop protection remain underexplored (Tamburini et al., 2020), potentially hindering the adoption of new IPM methods.

Identifying key invertebrates associated with farmland trees that benefit arable crop protection is challenging due to the dynamic nature of these systems (illustrated in Fig. 4), (Begg et al., 2017; González et al., 2022; Tscharntke et al., 2016). Advances in conservation biocontrol methods are addressing these complexities, providing valuable data such as dispersion distances for tree-associated natural enemies, which can improve pest management (Boller et al., 2004; Staton et al., 2019, 2021a). Enhancing pest control during vulnerable crop phases involves promoting diverse natural enemy guilds with different hunting strategies (Greenop et al., 2020; Woodcock et al., 2016).

Recent advances in artificial intelligence, molecular technologies, and remote sensing (e.g., radar, LiDAR, high-resolution drone imagery) are revolutionising field-based surveillance and providing new methods to monitor pest and natural enemy abundance, movement, and behaviours in agricultural systems (Badirli et al., 2023; Besson et al., 2022; Rhodes et al., 2022). These technologies are crucial for supporting integrated modelling systems that account for interactions between natural enemies, agricultural yields, and landscape composition. This approach will significantly enhance our ability to demonstrate and optimise the impact of natural enemies on food production and profitability across diverse management practices and environmental conditions (Sponagel et al., 2025).

## **4.2 Interactions between trees, pests, beneficial invertebrates, and management practices**




Figure 4. Illustrative summary of the key components, interactions, and need for measurement and promotion of farmland trees for IPM (adapted from Staton et al., 2019). IPM measurements depend on complex community interactions (dashed box), which in turn depend on farm planning and management. Effective communication and promotion of farmland trees are crucial for successful IPM.

#### 4.2.1 Field-scale: Ecological associations

A number of studies have investigated the role of adjacent semi-natural vegetation, field margins, and intercropping systems in conserving natural enemies for crop pest suppression (Bianchi et al., 2006; Haaland et al., 2011; Wolz et al., 2018). However, survey participants commented on the lack of detailed ecological studies that link temperate farmland trees with natural enemy taxa that prey on economically important pests in adjacent crops within temperate climates (Table 2; B.1 and B 2). They regarded this knowledge as essential for a broader analysis, linking tree species with pest suppression at farm level.

An initial examination of the availability of published literature detailing interactions between fifteen widespread native trees and shrubs and arthropods in Web of Science revealed that woody perennials are underrepresented in research on natural enemies and crop pests, with studies on 'pests' more frequently focussing on tree pests (Table 3, SI.3). Notably, a paucity of studies on species such as blackthorn (2 studies), one of three of the most common species found in hedges across British mainland (Dover, 2019) suggests there is a need for more research to help define how arthropods interact with this species. In contrast, other common hedgerow species such as hawthorn, hazel (*Corylus avellana* L.) and common elder (*Sambucus nigra* L.) appear to be more often studied in this context, with a total of 23 studies (Bennewicz & Barczak, 2020; Lee et al., 2015; Peñalver-Cruz et al., 2020; Wojciechowicz-Zytka & Jankowska, 2016), in addition to iconic species such as English oak (9 studies) (Ekholm et al., 2020, 2021; Van Dijk et al., 2022).

Online sources, such as the national plant health risk register, offer insights into tree species that host invasive arthropods (e.g. DEFRA, 2023). CABI's Compendium of Invasive Species (CABI, 2024b) offers detailed insights into hedge species like the Spindle tree (*Euonymus europaeus* L.), commonly used as a sentinel species to monitor aphid and natural enemy populations in central and eastern England's field crops (Way and Cammell, 1982). Conversely, we found that information on tree hosts of key natural enemy groups (Coleoptera, Arachnida, Diptera, Homoptera, and Hymenoptera) is not readily accessible due to the lack of dedicated online resources. This gap may pose challenges for non-research users seeking to identify tree species that support natural enemies of agricultural pests, which contribute to effective crop pest suppression.

**Table 3.** Publications on farmland trees' associations with a) arthropods, b) pests, and c) natural enemies, aiming to identify the overall supply of natural enemies and pests from trees, with d)

311 additional specific search terms for agricultural settings. Conducted using Web of Science (core  
312 collections), using Boolean terminology on 19 November 2024 (SI.3).

Tree or shrub species <sup>+</sup>	Number of publications describing			
Tree or shrub	a) Association with all invertebrates Search term: {English OR Latin names of tree} AND (arthropod* OR insect* OR invertebrate*)	b) Association with pests Search term: As (a) AND ("pest*" OR "herbiv*" OR "insect*")	c) Association with natural enemies Search term: As (a) AND ("natural enem*" OR "predator*" OR "parasitoid*")	d) Association with arable pests or natural enemies <sup>++</sup> : As (a), (b), and (c), AND ("agricultur*" OR "arable" OR "farm*" OR "crop*")
English oak, Pedunculate oak, <i>Quercus robur</i> L.	395	87	52	25 (9)
Common beech, <i>Fagus sylvatica</i> L.	308	39	39	19 (6)
Silver birch <i>Betula pendula</i> Roth	250	41	20	9 (2)
Hawthorn, common hawthorn, <i>Crataegus monogyna</i> Jacq.	241	46	24	21 (14)
Black alder, common alder, European alder, <i>Alnus glutinosa</i> (L.) Gaertn.	169	22	11	9 (3)
Hornbeam, common hornbeam, <i>Carpinus betulus</i> L.	115	16	18	7 (4)
Common ash, European ash, <i>Fraxinus excelsior</i> L.	114	27	14	7 (5)
Common hazel, <i>Corylus avellana</i> L.	68	30	11	12 (9)
Common elder, European elder, <i>Sambucus nigra</i> L.	59	23	9	20 (9)
Small-leaved lime, <i>Tilia cordata</i> Mill.	55	10	4	5 (2)
White poplar, <i>Populus alba</i> L.	55	19	2	4 (2)
Blackthorn, sloe, <i>Prunus spinosa</i> L.	41	5	2	4 (2)
Goat willow, <i>Salix caprea</i> L.	39	6	5	0

Common spindle, <i>Euonymus europaeus</i> L.	18	1	0	0
Field maple, <i>Acer campestre</i> L.	11	2	1	1 (1)

313    \*15 representative common native tall trees, small trees and woody shrubs found on farmland across England  
314    and Wales, selected on the basis of abundance (Dover, 2019). We include one widespread, naturalised species  
315    *P. alba* (Woodland Trust, 2024). \*\*Number in parentheses represents actual number of publications relevant to  
316    tree host, pest or natural enemies and agricultural landscapes.

317

318    Survey participants also noted that certain tree species can harbour arthropod groups associated  
319    with crop damage (e.g., *Aphididae*, *Drosophila suzukii* Matsumura) and livestock disease (e.g.,  
320    *Culicoides* spp.). Kletty et al.'s (2023) systematic review of silvoarable systems' impact on  
321    biodiversity indicates evidence of disservices that tree planting may have on pest abundance. For  
322    example, agroforestry systems tend to have higher slug densities than arable fields, likely due to  
323    higher soil moisture levels (Burgess et al., 2003; Staton et al., 2021). Additionally, farmland trees can  
324    harbour crop pests and bacterial diseases such as canker and fire blight (Dailey O'Brien, 2017; Staton  
325    et al., 2024). Understanding these trade-offs is crucial for maintaining stable species mixes that  
326    provide pest-control services beyond tree lines (Barczak et al., 2014). Recent models, integrating  
327    expert opinion and field data, have demonstrated the potential to understand these trade-offs in  
328    silvoarable systems (Tosh et al., 2024). However, given their longevity, diversifying tree species to  
329    adapt to changes in natural enemies, pests, and new crops may be a secondary factor when  
330    selecting a climate-resilient species mix (Broadmeadow et al., 2005).

331

332    Understanding how natural enemies move from tree habitats to crops and their impact on  
333    ecosystem services is crucial for precision farming in IPM (Saunders & Luck, 2014; Stafford, 2000;  
334    Woodcock et al., 2016), yet quantifying spillover for pest control remains poorly defined (Bailey et  
335    al., 2014; Morandin et al., 2014; Saunders & Luck, 2014). Boller et al., (2004) categorise natural

enemies into two groups to illustrate the link between functional infrastructure and cropping area based on their "operational distance," indicating habitats within 100 m suit flying or wind-borne species (e.g., syrphids, parasitoids, and some mites, spiders and predatory beetles), while distances of 100-500 m may reduce effectiveness for short-range dispersers, affecting seasonal distribution and species richness (Knapp et al., 2019). The ability and scale of movement of natural enemies, spatially and temporally, has become increasingly important in efficacy studies which aim to quantify the control of arable pests (Clobert et al., 2012; Shepard et al., 2013; Stephens et al., 2007).

#### **4.2.2 Farm-scale: Impact of tree layout, tree management and farm management on pest control services**

At farm and field scale, many studies emphasise the importance of vegetation management within IPM for controlling arable pests (Franks et al., 2016; Haaland et al., 2011; Holland et al., 2013), although our survey results indicate that this remains a priority research area (Table 2; B.3 and B.4). Hedgerows, protected from insecticides and tillage, serve as refuges for beneficial insects, providing food sources and alternative prey (Montgomery et al., 2020). Structural and floristic diversity of hedgerows benefits invertebrate diversity and certain natural enemy groups (Garratt et al., 2017; Wolton et al., 2014), with frequency and timing of management practices such as hedge cutting, playing a key role in determining their diversity (Staley et al., 2012, 2016).

The structure of field-boundary trees and shrubs can influence the distribution of aerial invertebrates (Holland et al., 2016, 2021). Graham et al. (2018) identified that height, width, woody biomass, nativeness, foliage quality, age structure, branching architecture, and hedgerow continuity can impact the abundance, survival, or fecundity of associated taxa. Amy et al. (2015) also found herbivores and predators' abundance was influenced by foliage density, while detritivore abundance correlated with hedge gap size.

Edge density of tree formations, i.e. the length of edges along treed habitats within a given area, is reported to impact natural enemy abundance and their ability to suppress crop pests (Bianchi et al., 2006; Burgess et al., 2003; Staton et al., 2021b). In an analysis of 49 studies from European agricultural landscapes, natural enemies which overwinter in non-crop habitats responded positively to high edge densities, in contrast to natural enemies that overwinter in cropped habitats (Martin et al., 2019). High edge densities also increased pest suppression and reduced pest abundance (Martin et al., 2019). The benefits of fine-grained landscapes with high edge densities are attributed to spillover effects from overwintering habitats, where natural enemies and associated pest control services disperse into adjacent farmed areas (Albrecht et al., 2020; Garratt et al., 2017).

Survey respondents pointed out the need for studies to address how farm management practices impact invertebrate-tree interactions, which could contribute to the observed heterogeneity in natural pest regulatory ecosystem services; Table 2, B.7 (see Kletty et al., 2023; Staton et al., 2019). A common theme was the application of synthetic insecticides, with evidence that certain classes can detrimentally affect the activity of natural enemies, including lethal or sub-lethal effects (Sánchez-Bayo, 2012), as well as inducing behavioural avoidance responses (Singh et al., 2001, 2004; Thornham et al., 2007). The sensitivity to pesticides, however, differs among natural enemy species (Greenop et al., 2020; Guedes et al., 2016) and across diverse agroecological systems (Boinot et al., 2020; Gagic et al., 2019; Ricci et al., 2019). While the impacts of pesticide drift on surrounding invertebrate populations are relatively well-documented (Gagic et al., 2019), it is apparent that more field studies would enhance our understanding of the resilience and recovery rates of natural enemy populations following management interventions (Beers et al., 2016).

Management interventions such as crop fertilisation and increasing investment in agrobiodiversity can also influence crop pests and their natural enemies (e.g., Albrecht et al., 2020; Tamburini et al.,

2016). A broad study across different regions and farming systems shows that diverse flower mixes enhance natural pest control in adjacent fields (Albrecht et al., 2020). This suggests that managing and restoring perennial floral plantings can boost pest regulatory services by providing high floral diversity for beneficial arthropods. However, few studies explore the benefits of healthy soils for perennial hosts, such as trees and shrubs supporting natural enemies at the periphery of arable crops. While nitrogen accumulation in soils can reportedly harm pollinators (Stevens et al., 2018), certain fertilisers may benefit some natural enemy taxa (Garratt et al., 2011).

In accordance with IPM principles set out by the EU Directive (European Commission, 2009), the strategic application of effective pesticides remains an essential option in reducing economic losses due to pest and disease damage. There is a critical need for a suite of target-specific compounds that are compatible with the life stages and foraging behaviours of both beneficial and non-target organisms. To address the variability in the abundance and efficacy of natural enemies in suppressing crop pests, it is essential to investigate and optimise spatial and temporal farm management practices to mitigate negative impacts. Balancing product selection, application frequency, and enhancing agroecological conditions is key to supporting the resilience and stability of predator and parasitoid populations in farmland trees.

#### **4.2.3 Landscape-scale: Distribution and resilience of pest regulatory services under climate change**

Associations between insects and their tree hosts can be impacted by a range of factors beyond those imposed through tree arrangement and farm management measures (Table 2; B3-B.6), potentially affecting the quality and flow of pest regulation services for IPM. Studies have assessed the distribution of semi-natural habitats in order to evaluate the impact on the abundance of beneficial organisms and the effectiveness of pest control (Alignier et al., 2014; Hatt et al., 2018). Strategically arranging trees in linear corridors or as “stepping stones” can amplify their impact on

pest control by connecting functional habitats with arable fields. Studies have provided evidence that enhancing agricultural landscape diversity increases the abundance and diversity of natural enemy groups (Marshall, 2004; Marshall et al., 2006), although gaps remain in demonstrating how this relates to reduction in pest damage in adjacent crops (Tscharntke et al., 2016).

For farmland trees to effectively promote IPM, the phenologies of natural enemies must align with tree resource availability and coexist with arable pests both spatially and temporally. Otherwise, the effectiveness of trees in IPM strategies will be diminished (Ramos Aguila et al., 2023). The development of innovative tools to map and predict biodiversity supported by farmland trees at a regional scale represents a significant advancement in ecological research (Harrison et al., 2021). Nevertheless, the accuracy of these tools in forecasting natural enemies of crop pests at catchment or farm levels remains to be validated.

The dynamic nature of ecosystems, especially under the influence of climate change and human actions, calls for long-term studies into the resilience of trees to pest pressure, to ensure a sustainable IPM framework in the broader agricultural landscape (Baker et al., 2000; Panzavolta et al., 2021). Abiotic and biotic factors can affect host-insect level interactions through diminishing or enhancing availability or suitability of the host plant. Soil properties, hydrology, aspect and elevation are reported to alter plant-tissue chemistry (Karolewski et al., 2013; Pichersky and Raguso, 2018) and morphology, food-reward attractiveness and 'host apparency' (Zverev et al., 2017).

Frameworks that demonstrate the current and predicted geographic range shifts of multiple taxa have been adopted for conservation assessment (Natural England and RSPB, 2019), explaining the vulnerability of species and species groups associated with specific habitat types studied in the UK (Pearce-Higgins et al., 2017). Additionally, climate-suitability analysis has been extended to predict

where invasive forest insect species may expand their range and threaten tree hosts (Venette, 2017). However, there is a concern that the predicted climate distribution matches of pests with their natural enemies may be jeopardized if the populations of the latter fail to establish successfully due to other factors such as asynchrony (Fischbein et al., 2019). Developing and validating models to understand interactions among trees, crops, pests, and natural enemies at multiple scales remains an important area of research to answer questions on the role of farmland trees in IPM.

### **4.3 Monitoring, promotion and regulation**

#### **4.3.1 Measuring IPM benefits for trees**

In this study, participants highlighted the need for a comprehensive system-based approach in IPM to evaluate the role of trees in pest control (Table 2, C2). Johnson et al. (2021) also notes that few studies address crop-related outcomes or economic impacts. Creissen et al. (2019) proposed a framework to capture multiple IPM activities simultaneously. Multi-attribute, flexible metric frameworks can be adjusted based on expert opinion, reflecting the spectrum of IPM adoption across farming practices and locations, potentially including components such as farmland trees.

The availability of data remains a significant limitation in measuring and evidencing the beneficial effects of semi-natural habitats on biological control (Holland et al., 2016). The reliability of using natural enemy abundance or diversity as proxies for natural pest control has been questioned, given the context-dependent nature of these relationships (Jonsson et al., 2017; Perović et al., 2018; Tamburini et al., 2020). Consequently, recent research has shifted towards a trait-based approach, finding that the diversity of functional traits among natural enemies is a more robust predictor of pest suppression (Jonsson et al., 2017; Perović et al., 2018; Tamburini, Santoiemma, et al., 2020). Combining single-trait identities and multi-trait complementarity offers greater explanatory power for ecosystem functioning than traditional taxonomic approaches (Gagic et al., 2015). For instance,

Greenop et al. (2018) demonstrated that functional trait diversity of natural enemies was the best predictor of prey suppression in a meta-analysis of mesocosm experiments. Trait-based approaches can also enhance our understanding of how farmland trees influence pest management needs (Staton et al., 2021a). Developing a trait-based approach could establish a predictive framework for the effects of farmland trees on pests. However, intraspecific trait variability in trees, which could be crucial for plant-insect interactions, has received little attention.

Advancements in techniques and technologies are broadening the scope for accurately assessing the effectiveness of natural enemies in IPM settings. For instance, the use of sentinel prey, such as live, dead or artificial prey, enables detailed quantification of predation or parasitism rates (Chisholm et al., 2014; Howard et al., 2024; Lövei & Ferrante, 2017), although the effectiveness can vary by the type of sentinel used and the predator species involved (Greenop et al., 2019; McHugh et al., 2020; Nagy et al., 2020). Exclusion methods compare pest levels with and without natural enemies but applications are often labour intensive and have practical difficulties (Chisholm et al., 2014). Additionally, molecular methods provide a sophisticated means of analysing the diets of natural enemies, thereby pinpointing their roles within IPM frameworks (Furlong, 2015). On a larger scale, precision monitoring of tree cover on farmlands could refine evaluations of how trees contribute to IPM, offering insights into potential yield benefits from microclimate moderation (Redhead et al., 2020), while also considering the trade-offs due to resource competition (Ivezić et al., 2021). These developments highlight the complex but critical nature of optimising IPM strategies to balance ecological benefits with agricultural productivity.

#### **4.3.2 Regulation and initiatives to promote trees for IPM**

The EU set the IPM agenda in Europe, mandating all member states should adopt IPM strategies by January 2014 through the Sustainable Use Directive (European Commission, 2009). The Common

Agricultural Policy (CAP) and the Farm to Fork and Biodiversity initiatives aim to support a 50% reduction in pesticide use by 2030, and promote sustainable agriculture practices (European Commission, 2009, 2020; TEEB, 2018). In England, the Environmental Land Management (ELM) strategy aligns with the EU vision, setting out a pathway to enhance biodiversity and minimize pesticide use (Gov.UK, 2023b). Specifically, the Sustainable Farming Incentive (SFI) schemes implemented between 2022 and 2025 included several key actions to support the voluntary uptake of IPM (DEFRA, 2024a, 2025). Within this framework, farmers were encouraged farmers to develop IPM plans with qualified advisors (BASIS, 2024; The Voluntary Initiative, 2024b) to establish habitats for natural enemies and pollinators through establishing flower-rich grass margins, blocks or strips, to plant companion crops, and avoid or limit the use insecticides (DEFRA, 2024; Gov.UK, 2024b).

While industry advocates for incentivising farmers to adopt IPM, with progress tracked and biological crop protection solutions defined in national legislation (IBMA, 2021), inconsistencies in the methods to monitor the effectiveness of these efforts across the EU or the UK remain a challenge (Helepiciuc & Todor, 2022).

At present, there are substantial national and international initiatives to increase the rate of tree establishment such as the Nature for Climate fund in the UK dedicating over £500 million to tree planting and management (Gov.UK, 2021) and the EU Biodiversity Strategy for 2030 aiming to plant three billion more trees across the EU by 2030 (FISE, 2022). In England, various incentive schemes support woodland creation, agroforestry systems and the planting of farmland hedge shrubs and trees (Gov.UK, 2025c, 2025d, 2025b), with regulations in place to protect existing trees and hedgerows on farmland (Woolford & Jarvis, 2017). However, developed guidelines tend to lean towards the role of hedgerows or trees as providers of biodiverse habitats for woodland and farmland species rather than focusing on the contribution to farm IPM (Gov.UK, 2025a).

Survey participants emphasised the importance of effectively communicating the commercial viability and reliability of IPM innovations to enhance their adoption (Table 2, C3-5). Assessment toolkits were highlighted as essential for integrating tree benefits into IPM, allowing for pest control scenarios by adjusting layout, species, and tree management based on pest traits. This aligns with a consultation by Walters et al. (2024), where 130 UK stakeholders recommended enhancing IPM knowledge exchange through diverse methods, including decision support tools, professional training, demonstration farms, and farm-to-farm engagement hubs. Recommendations included the need to integrate trees into IPM strategies and called for a national action plan to coordinate efforts (Walters et al., 2024). Significant advancements in creating accessible toolkits for IPM in field crops include the IPMWORKS Resource Toolbox and online self-assessment platforms (IPMWORKS, 2024), developed through partnerships with ADAS, NFU, SRUC, and the Voluntary Initiative (NFU, 2023).

The implementation of IPM practices must also consider future climate compatibility (Roncoli, 2006), informed by a co-design and participatory approach (Lamichhane et al., 2018). Our survey group emphasised the importance of local knowledge in developing analytic tools to measure IPM benefits (SI.1, C.2). In this context, demonstration sites are highly effective for facilitating knowledge exchange and the adoption of conservation practices, especially when well-funded (Singh et al., 2018) (SI.1, C.5). In England and Wales, demonstration farms serve as crucial links between research and practical application (AHDB, 2024). The LEAF partnership in the UK established demonstration farms and research centres to promote IPM using environmental self-audit tools (LEAF, 2024). A large network of demonstration farms in Europe, coordinated by IPMWORKS (2024), also aims to expand its network of farms, representing 26 countries across the EU and the UK. This project seeks to standardise successful IPM strategies, reporting management details, pesticide use, and profitability, with the goal of halving pesticide use in European agriculture by 2035.

538 Few resources explicitly address the crop protection benefits of farmland trees. The Soil  
539 Association's UK Agroforestry Handbook is a notable exception, providing non-experts with methods  
540 to reduce pest competition by integrating trees into farm landscapes (Raskin & Osborn, 2019).  
541 Earthwatch Europe's report highlights the economic and sustainability benefits of tree planting in  
542 agriculture but calls for further research to enhance environmental impacts (Cardenas et al., 2021).  
543 Recently, Natural Resources Wales has developed guidance on managing natural resources,  
544 including the Ancient Woodland Inventory and the National Survey for Wales (Natural Resources  
545 Wales, 2020).

546

547 While promoting biodiversity in natural and agricultural settings is on the political agenda, there is  
548 an opportunity to increase the prominence of IPM principles through higher education curricula.  
549 However, the eight principles of IPM currently overlook the social and economic dimensions of  
550 implementation and the organisation of farm advisory services (Deguine et al., 2021). Effective IPM  
551 deployment depends on these non-technical factors, including economic conditions, social contexts  
552 of farmers, the efficacy of advisory services, and collaborative multi-actor strategies, all of which  
553 require greater focus.

554

555 Addressing critical areas highlighted by our expert group, we emphasise the complexity of  
556 socioeconomic, environmental, and ecological factors in future research to quantify trees'  
557 contributions. With increased attention on ecological and tree-distribution at all scales, the valuable  
558 services provided by farmland trees can be measured, sustained and enhanced, reducing chemical  
559 pest control reliance, and boosting productivity. This will enable growers to adopt more sustainable  
560 agricultural practices, reduce reliance on chemical pest control, and potentially increase land  
561 productivity. Research to understand how incentive schemes and private financial mechanisms can  
562 support land management for increasing benefits from tree-natural enemy associations for crop

protection will markedly increase the understanding and implementation of IPM on arable farmland (Grigoriadis et al., 2023). Given the interest in planting trees across European farmland for pest control, increased investment in optimising these services for IPM would be well justified.

## 5. CONCLUSIONS

‘Can farmland trees contribute to IPM strategies in agricultural landscapes?’ We adopted a participatory approach to this broad question in light of the complex interactions in delivering multiple ecosystem services (Fagerholm et al., 2012; Jacobs et al., 2015; Krueger et al., 2012), specifically associated with integrating trees within IPM frameworks (Ambrose-Oji et al., 2022; Blanco et al., 2020; Brown et al., 2022). Individual trees and tree configurations, such as windbreaks and hedges, provide critical seasonal resources for beneficial arthropods, offering food, shelter and sites for reproduction. Advances in remote sensing technologies, including satellite imagery, aerial photos, and drone data, have greatly improved the mapping and management of trees across landscapes (Hunter et al., 2025). Advanced mapping tools and modelling systems are now enabling assessment of management strategies at field, farm and regional scale (Burgess et al., 2019; Harrison et al., 2021; Schneider et al., 2023; Suprunenko et al., 2021). However, despite the availability of tools for assessing trees and ecosystem services (Ecosystems Knowledge Network, 2024; European Commission, 2023; Smith et al., 2021), there remains a significant gap in technologies specifically designed to evaluate the interactions between farmland trees and IPM. Developing effective decision support tools will require further research and validation, with sustained financial investment in both foundational research and practical applications.

Demonstration farms, established through academia-industry partnerships (e.g. LEAF, 2024), are considered important for showcasing sustainable agriculture practices and innovative farming

techniques. These farms serve as real-world examples where growers and researchers can form collaborations to address practical and economic challenges that can hinder adoption of IPM strategies (Walters et al., 2024). Furthermore, these interactions offer a platform to disseminate future research investigations to qualify and quantify the role of trees as integral elements of IPM systems. Promoting the economic and environmental benefits of IPM delivered by trees on arable farmland will lead to the development of farming systems that are more adaptable to climate variations and environmentally sustainable.

## **Acknowledgments**

We appreciate the knowledge and opinions given by the individuals who participated in the initial survey. All survey responses given were considered and used to refine the scope of the final review. We are very grateful to Iain Dummett and colleagues at FPPH for supporting the work and for useful feedback given on early versions of the manuscript. We additionally thank the reviewers for their time and advice freely given, which enabled us to refine an earlier version of this literature review.

## **Funding**

The project was supported with funding from Defra's Future Proofing Plant Health Programme and led by researchers from the Royal Botanic Gardens Kew, Nottingham Trent University, Royal Agricultural University, Cranfield University and Imperial College London.

## **Conflict of interest**

The authors declare that there are no competing interests associated with the manuscript.

## **Author contributions**

All authors contributed to the development of the stakeholder’s questionnaire, analysis of the responses received and dissemination of the initial responses to contributing participants. Authors contributed equally to reviewing the relevant literature and editing of the manuscript.

### **Data availability**

The initial report compiled to disseminate the stakeholder-elicitation results and comments to contributing participants, will be made available in PDF format upon request.

### **Disclaimer**

The views expressed in the paper are those of the authors, and they do not necessarily reflect the views of the funding agency or the affiliated institutions.

### **References**

- AHDB. (2021). *Encyclopaedia of pests and natural enemies* (p. 214). Agriculture and Horticulture Development Board.  
<https://projectblue.blob.core.windows.net/media/Default/Imported%20Publication%20Docs/AHDB%20Cereals%20&%20Oilseeds/Pests/Encyclopaedia%20of%20pests%20and%20natural%20enemies%20in%20field%20crops.pdf>
- AHDB. (2024). *AHDB cereals & oilseeds monitor farms* [Online post]. <https://ahdb.org.uk/monitor-farms>
- Albrecht, M., Kleijn, D., Williams, N. M., Tschumi, M., Blaauw, B. R., Bommarco, R., Campbell, A. J., Dainese, M., Drummond, F. A., Entling, M. H., Ganser, D., Arjen de Groot, G., Goulson, D., Grab, H., Hamilton, H., Herzog, F., Isaacs, R., Jacot, K., Jeanneret, P., ... Sutter, L. (2020). The effectiveness of flower strips and hedgerows on pest control, pollination services and crop yield: A quantitative synthesis. *Ecology Letters*, 23(10), 1488–1498. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ele.13576>
- Alignier, A., Raymond, L., Deconchat, M., Menozzi, P., Monteil, C., Sarthou, J.-P., Vialatte, A., & Ouin, A. (2014). The effect of semi-natural habitats on aphids and their natural enemies across spatial and temporal scales. *Biological Control*, 77, 76–82. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocontrol.2014.06.006>
- Ambrose-Oji, B., Goodenough, A., Urquhart, J., Hall, C., & Karlsdóttir, B. (2022). ‘We’re Farmers Not Foresters’: Farmers’ Decision-Making and Behaviours towards Managing Trees for Pests and Diseases. *Forests*, 13(7), 1030. <https://doi.org/10.3390/f13071030>
- Amy, S. R., Heard, M. S., Hartley, S. E., George, C. T., Pywell, R. F., & Staley, J. T. (2015). Hedgerow rejuvenation management affects invertebrate communities through changes to habitat structure. *Basic and Applied Ecology*, 16(5), 443–451. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.baae.2015.04.002>

642 Badirli, S., Picard, C. J., Mohler, G., Richert, F., Akata, Z., & Dundar, M. (2023). Classifying the  
643 unknown: Insect identification with deep hierarchical Bayesian learning. *Methods in Ecology and*  
644 *Evolution*, 14(6), 1515–1530. <https://doi.org/10.1111/2041-210X.14104>

645 Bailey, S., Requier, F., Nusillard, B., Roberts, S. P. M., Potts, S. G., & Bouget, C. (2014). Distance from  
646 forest edge affects bee pollinators in oilseed rape fields. *Ecology and Evolution*, 4(4), 370–380.  
647 <https://doi.org/10.1002/ece3.924>

648 Baker, R. H. A., Sansford, C. E., Jarvis, C. H., Cannon, R. J. C., MacLeod, A., & Walters, K. F. A. (2000).  
649 The role of climatic mapping in predicting the potential geographical distribution of non-indigenous  
650 pests under current and future climates. *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment*, 82(1–3), 57–71.  
651 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0167-8809\(00\)00216-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0167-8809(00)00216-4)

652 Barczak, T., Bennewicz, J., & Brochocka, A. (2014). Reservoirs of Parasitoids (Hymenoptera) of the  
653 Grain Aphid Sitobion avenae F. on Wild Growing Plants in Poland. *EGYPTIAN JOURNAL OF*  
654 *BIOLOGICAL PEST CONTROL*, 24(2), 483–490.

655 Barzman, M., Bàrberi, P., Birch, A. N. E., Boonekamp, P., Dachbrodt-Saaydeh, S., Graf, B., Hommel,  
656 B., Jensen, J. E., Kiss, J., Kudsk, P., Lamichhane, J. R., Messéan, A., Moonen, A.-C., Ratnadass, A., Ricci,  
657 P., Sarah, J.-L., & Sattin, M. (2015). Eight principles of integrated pest management. *Agronomy for*  
658 *Sustainable Development*, 35(4), 1199–1215. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13593-015-0327-9>

659 BASIS. (2024). *BASIS: Find An Adviser tool* [On-line]. <https://basis-reg.co.uk/find-an-adviser>

660 Beck, K. G., Zimmerman, K., Schardt, J. D., Stone, J., Lukens, R. R., Reichard, S., Randall, J., Cangelosi,  
661 A. A., Cooper, D., & Thompson, J. P. (2008). Invasive Species Defined in a Policy Context:  
662 Recommendations from the Federal Invasive Species Advisory Committee. *Invasive Plant Science and*  
663 *Management*, 1(4), 414–421. <https://doi.org/10.1614/IPSM-08-089.1>

664 Beers, E. H., Mills, N. J., Shearer, P. W., Horton, D. R., Milickzy, E. R., Amarasekare, K. G., & Gontijo, L.  
665 M. (2016). Nontarget effects of orchard pesticides on natural enemies: Lessons from the field and  
666 laboratory. *Biological Control*, 102, 44–52. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocontrol.2016.04.010>

667 Begg, G. S., Cook, S. M., Dye, R., Ferrante, M., Franck, P., Lavigne, C., Lövei, G. L., Mansion-Vaquie, A.,  
668 Pell, J. K., Petit, S., Quesada, N., Ricci, B., Wratten, S. D., & Birch, A. N. E. (2017). A functional  
669 overview of conservation biological control. *Crop Protection*, 97, 145–158.  
670 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cropro.2016.11.008>

671 Bennewicz, J., & Barczak, T. (2020). Ground beetles (Carabidae) of field margin habitats. *Biologia*,  
672 75(10), 1631–1641. <https://doi.org/10.2478/s11756-020-00424-y>

673 Benton, T. G., Vickery, J. A., & Wilson, J. D. (2003). Farmland biodiversity: Is habitat heterogeneity  
674 the key? *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, 18(4), 182–188. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0169-](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0169-5347(03)00011-9)  
675 [5347\(03\)00011-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0169-5347(03)00011-9)

676 Besson, M., Alison, J., Bjerger, K., Gorochofski, T. E., Høye, T. T., Jucker, T., Mann, H. M. R., &  
677 Clements, C. F. (2022). Towards the fully automated monitoring of ecological communities. *Ecology*  
678 *Letters*, 25(12), 2753–2775. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ele.14123>

679 Bianchi, F. J. J. A., Booij, C. J. H., & Tscharnkte, T. (2006). Sustainable pest regulation in agricultural  
680 landscapes: A review on landscape composition, biodiversity and natural pest control. *Proceedings of*  
681 *the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 273(1595), 1715–1727.  
682 <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2006.3530>

683 Birch, A. N. E., Begg, G. S., & Squire, G. R. (2011). How agro-ecological research helps to address food  
684 security issues under new IPM and pesticide reduction policies for global crop production systems.  
685 *Journal of Experimental Botany*, 62(10), 3251–3261. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jxb/err064>

686 Blanco, J., Sourdril, A., Deconchat, M., Barnaud, C., San Cristobal, M., & Andrieu, E. (2020). How  
687 farmers feel about trees: Perceptions of ecosystem services and disservices associated with rural  
688 forests in southwestern France. *Ecosystem Services*, 42, 101066.  
689 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecoser.2020.101066>

690 Boinot, S., Mézière, D., Poulmarc'h, J., Saintilan, A., Lauri, P.-E., & Sarthou, J.-P. (2020). Promoting  
691 generalist predators of crop pests in alley cropping agroforestry fields: Farming system matters.  
692 *Ecological Engineering*, 158, 106041. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecoleng.2020.106041>

693 Boller, E., Häni, F., & Poehling, H.-M. (2004). *Ecological Infrastructures: Idea book on functional*  
694 *biodiversity at the farm level. Temperate zones of Europe*. Landwirtschaftliche Beratungszentrale  
695 Lindau. [https://iobc-wprs.org/product/ecological-infrastructures-ideabook-on-functional-](https://iobc-wprs.org/product/ecological-infrastructures-ideabook-on-functional-biodiversity-at-the-farm-level-temperate-zones-of-europe/)  
696 [biodiversity-at-the-farm-level-temperate-zones-of-europe/](https://iobc-wprs.org/product/ecological-infrastructures-ideabook-on-functional-biodiversity-at-the-farm-level-temperate-zones-of-europe/)

697 Brewer, A., Ditchburn, B., Cross, D., Whitton, E., & Ward. (2017). *Tree cover outside woodland in*  
698 *Great Britain*. (p. 96) [National Forest Inventory Report].  
699 [https://cdn.forestresearch.gov.uk/2022/02/fr\\_tree\\_cover\\_outside\\_woodland\\_in\\_gb\\_statistical\\_rep](https://cdn.forestresearch.gov.uk/2022/02/fr_tree_cover_outside_woodland_in_gb_statistical_report_2017.pdf)  
700 [ort\\_2017.pdf](https://cdn.forestresearch.gov.uk/2022/02/fr_tree_cover_outside_woodland_in_gb_statistical_report_2017.pdf)

701 Broadmeadow, M. S. J., Ray, D., & Samuel, C. J. A. (2005). Climate change and the future for  
702 broadleaved tree species in Britain. *Forestry: An International Journal of Forest Research*, 78(2), 145–  
703 161. <https://doi.org/10.1093/forestry/cpi014>

704 Brown, K., Batterham, P. J., Schirmer, J., & Upton, P. (2022). Principles or practice? The impact of  
705 natural resource management on farmer well-being and social connectedness. *Society & Natural*  
706 *Resources*, 35(10), 1083–1101. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08941920.2022.2058133>

707 Burgess, P. J., Graves, A., García de Jalón, S., Palma, J., Dupraz, C., & van Noordwijk, M. (2019).  
708 Modelling agroforestry systems. In *Agroforestry for Sustainable Agriculture*. Mosquera-Losada M.R.,  
709 Prabhu, R. (Eds) (pp. 209–238). Burleigh Dodds Science Publishing Limited.

710 Burgess, P. J., Incoll, L. D., Hart, B. J., Beaton, A., Piper, R. W., Seymour, I., Reynolds, F. H., Wright, C.,  
711 Pilbeam, D., & Graves, A. R. (2003). *The Impact of Silvoarable Agroforestry with Poplar on Farm*  
712 *Profitability and Biological Diversity*. (Final Report for DEFRA Project Code: AF0105; p. 63). Cranfield  
713 University. [https://www.rosspiper.net/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/AF0105\\_7417\\_FRP-1.pdf](https://www.rosspiper.net/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/AF0105_7417_FRP-1.pdf)

714 CABI. (2024a). *CABI BioProtection Portal* [Online post]. <https://bioprotectionportal.com/>

715 CABI. (2024b). *CABI Invasive Species Compendium*, [Online post]. [https://www.cabi.org/publishing-](https://www.cabi.org/publishing-products/invasive-species-compendium/)  
716 [products/invasive-species-compendium/](https://www.cabi.org/publishing-products/invasive-species-compendium/)

717 Cardenas, M., Crockatt, M., & van Noordwijk, T. (2021). *Policy recommendations for increasing*  
718 *ecosystem services from trees in agricultural landscapes*. (p. 6). Earthwatch Europe.  
719 <https://ora.ox.ac.uk/objects/uuid:ee4bb3ee-7342-4cfe-a02a-bc16985f24c9/files/rg732d9994>

720 Carey, P. D., Wallis, S., Chamberlain, P. M., Cooper, A., Emmett, B. A., Maskell, L. C., McCann, T.,  
721 Murphy, J., Norton, L. R., Reynolds, B., Scott, W. A., Simpson, I., Smart, S. M., & Ulyett, J. M. (2008).  
722 *Countryside survey: UK results from 2007*. (Results Project No. C03259; p. 119). Centre for Ecology &  
723 Hydrology. <https://nora.nerc.ac.uk/id/eprint/5191/1/N005191CR%20UK%20Results.pdf>

Chisholm, P. J., Gardiner, M. M., Moon, E. G., & Crowder, D. W. (2014). Tools and techniques for investigating impacts of habitat complexity on biological control. *Biological Control*, 75, 48–57. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocontrol.2014.02.003>

Clobert, J., Baguette, M., Benton, T. G., & Bullock, J. M. (2012). *Dispersal ecology and evolution*. Oxford University Press.

Crees, J. J., & Turvey, S. T. (2015). What constitutes a ‘native’ species? Insights from the Quaternary faunal record. *Biological Conservation*, 186, 143–148. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2015.03.007>

Creissen, H. E., Jones, P. J., Tranter, R. B., Girling, R. D., Jess, S., Burnett, F. J., Gaffney, M., Thorne, F. S., & Kildea, S. (2019). Measuring the unmeasurable? A method to quantify adoption of integrated pest management practices in temperate arable farming systems. *Pest Management Science*, 75(12), 3144–3152. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ps.5428>

Dailey O’Brien, D. (2017). *Hawthorn diseases and insects* (eCommons). Cornell University. <https://hdl.handle.net/1813/60585>

Daniels, S., Witters, N., Beliën, T., Vrancken, K., Vangronsveld, J., & Van Passel, S. (2017). Monetary Valuation of Natural Predators for Biological Pest Control in Pear Production. *Ecological Economics*, 134, 160–173. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2016.12.029>

DEFRA. (2023a). *Plant biosecurity strategy for Great Britain (2023 to 2028)* [Policy paper]. Department for Environment, Food & Rural Affairs, Gov.UK. <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/plant-biosecurity-strategy-for-great-britain-2023-to-2028#:~:text=The%20UK%20operates%20a%20risk,outlined%20further%20in%20Chapter%203.>

DEFRA. (2023b). *UK Plant Health Risk Register* [Online post]. <https://planthealthportal.defra.gov.uk/pests-and-diseases/uk-plant-health-risk-register/>

DEFRA. (2024a). *Sustainable Farming Incentive (SFI) Handbook for the SFI 2023 offer* (p. 171) [Rural Payments Agency]. [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/6626521d1cbbb3400ba7e51f/SFI23\\_handbook\\_v6.0.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/6626521d1cbbb3400ba7e51f/SFI23_handbook_v6.0.pdf)

DEFRA. (2024b). *UK Plant Health Risk Register* [Online post]. <https://planthealthportal.defra.gov.uk/pests-and-diseases/uk-plant-health-risk-register/>

DEFRA. (2025). *An update on the Sustainable Farming Incentive* [Department for Environment, Food & Rural Affairs]. <https://defrafarming.blog.gov.uk/2025/03/11/an-update-on-the-sustainable-farming-incentive/>

Deguine, J.-P., Aubertot, J.-N., Flor, R. J., Lescourret, F., Wyckhuys, K. A. G., & Ratnadass, A. (2021). Integrated pest management: Good intentions, hard realities. A review. *Agronomy for Sustainable Development*, 41(3), 38. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13593-021-00689-w>

Dix, M. E., Johnson, R. J., Harrell, M. O., Case, R. M., Wright, R. J., Hodges, L., Brandle, J. R., Schoeneberger, M. M., Sunderman, N. J., Fitzmaurice, R. L., Young, L. J., & Hubbard, K. G. (1995). Influences of trees on abundance of natural enemies of insect pests: A review. *Agroforestry Systems*, 29(3), 303–311. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00704876>

Donkersley, P. (2019). Trees for bees. *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment*, 270–271, 79–83. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2018.10.024>

765 Dover, J. (2019). *The ecology of hedgerows and field margins*. Routledge.

766 Ecosystems Knowledge Network. (2024). *Mapping Ecosystem Services* [Computer software].  
767 <https://ecosystemsknowledge.net/resources/tool-assessor-categories/mapping-ecosystem-services/>

768 Ekholm, A., Faticov, M., Tack, A. J. M., Berger, J., Stone, G. N., Vesterinen, E., & Roslin, T. (2021).  
769 Community phenology of insects on oak: Local differentiation along a climatic gradient. *Ecosphere*,  
770 12(11), e03785. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ecs2.3785>

771 Ekholm, A., Tack, A. J. M., Pulkkinen, P., & Roslin, T. (2020). Host plant phenology, insect outbreaks  
772 and herbivore communities – The importance of timing. *Journal of Animal Ecology*, 89(3), 829–841.  
773 <https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2656.13151>

774 EPA. (2022). *Integrated Pest Management (IPM) Principles* [Online post]. U.S. Environmental  
775 Protection Agency. [https://www.epa.gov/safepestcontrol/integrated-pest-management-ipm-](https://www.epa.gov/safepestcontrol/integrated-pest-management-ipm-principles)  
776 [principles](https://www.epa.gov/safepestcontrol/integrated-pest-management-ipm-principles)

777 EPPO. (2024). *European and Mediterranean Plant Protection Organization Global Data Base* [Online  
778 post]. <https://gd.eppo.int/>

779 European Commission. (2009). *Directive No. 2009/128/EC of the European Parliament and of the*  
780 *Council of 21 October 2009 establishing a framework for Community action to achieve the*  
781 *sustainable use of pesticides. Official Journal of the European Union L 309, 24.11.2009, p.71–86 (L*  
782 *324, 10.12.2009; Official Journal of the European Union, pp. 71–86). The European Parliament and*  
783 *the Council of the European Union.* [https://eur-](https://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2009:309:0071:0086:en:PDF)  
784 [lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2009:309:0071:0086:en:PDF](https://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2009:309:0071:0086:en:PDF)

785 European Commission. (2020). *Farm to fork strategy: For a fair, healthy and environmentally-friendly*  
786 *food system. Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the*  
787 *European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions* (381; Communication  
788 from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social  
789 Committee and the Committee of the Regions, pp. 1–9). European Commission.

790 European Commission. (2023). *Farmer’s toolbox for integrated pest management – Final report*.  
791 European Commission, Directorate-General for Agriculture and Rural Development,.  
792 <https://data.europa.eu/doi/10.2762/457165>

793 Fagerholm, N., Käyhkö, N., Ndumbaro, F., & Khamis, M. (2012). Community stakeholders’ knowledge  
794 in landscape assessments – Mapping indicators for landscape services. *Ecological Indicators*, 18,  
795 421–433. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2011.12.004>

796 Fischbein, D., Lantschner, M. V., & Corley, J. C. (2019). Modelling the distribution of forest pest  
797 natural enemies across invaded areas: Towards understanding the influence of climate on parasitoid  
798 establishment success. *Biological Control*, 132, 177–188.  
799 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocontrol.2019.02.016>

800 FISE. (2022). *3 Billion Trees to be planted in Europe by 2030*. [https://forest.eea.europa.eu/3-billion-](https://forest.eea.europa.eu/3-billion-trees/introduction)  
801 [trees/introduction](https://forest.eea.europa.eu/3-billion-trees/introduction)

802 Forestry Commission. (2001). *National Inventory of Woodland and Trees: England*.  
803 [https://www.forestryresearch.gov.uk/tools-and-resources/national-forest-inventory/national-](https://www.forestryresearch.gov.uk/tools-and-resources/national-forest-inventory/national-inventory-of-woodland-and-trees/national-inventory-of-woodland-and-trees-england/)  
804 [inventory-of-woodland-and-trees/national-inventory-of-woodland-and-trees-england/](https://www.forestryresearch.gov.uk/tools-and-resources/national-forest-inventory/national-inventory-of-woodland-and-trees/national-inventory-of-woodland-and-trees-england/)

805 Forestry Commission. (2002). *National Inventory of Woodland and Trees: Wales*.  
806 [https://www.forestresearch.gov.uk/tools-and-resources/national-forest-inventory/national-](https://www.forestresearch.gov.uk/tools-and-resources/national-forest-inventory/national-inventory-of-woodland-and-trees/national-inventory-of-woodland-and-trees-england/)  
807 [inventory-of-woodland-and-trees/national-inventory-of-woodland-and-trees-england/](https://www.forestresearch.gov.uk/tools-and-resources/national-forest-inventory/national-inventory-of-woodland-and-trees/national-inventory-of-woodland-and-trees-england/)

808 Frank, J., & Gillett-Kaufman, J. (2021). *Glossary of expressions in biological control* (IPM-143/IN673;  
809 p. 11). IFAS Extension, University of Florida. <https://edis.ifas.ufl.edu/publication/IN673>

810 Franks, J. R., Emery, S. B., Whittingham, M. J., McKenzie, A. J., Franks, J. R., Emery, S. B.,  
811 Whittingham, M. J., & McKenzie, A. J. (2016). *Farmer attitudes to cross-holding agri-environment*  
812 *schemes and their implications for Countryside Stewardship*.  
813 <https://doi.org/10.22004/AG.ECON.287260>

814 Furlong, M. J. (2015). Knowing your enemies: Integrating molecular and ecological methods to assess  
815 the impact of arthropod predators on crop pests: Quantifying arthropod predation. *Insect Science*,  
816 22(1), 6–19. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1744-7917.12157>

817 Gagic, V., Bartomeus, I., Jonsson, T., Taylor, A., Winqvist, C., Fischer, C., Slade, E. M., Steffan-  
818 Dewenter, I., Emmerson, M., Potts, S. G., Tscharrntke, T., Weisser, W., & Bommarco, R. (2015).  
819 Functional identity and diversity of animals predict ecosystem functioning better than species-based  
820 indices. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 282(1801), 20142620.  
821 <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2014.2620>

822 Gagic, V., Hulthen, A. D., Marcora, A., Wang, X., Jones, L., & Schellhorn, N. A. (2019). Biocontrol in  
823 insecticide sprayed crops does not benefit from semi-natural habitats and recovers slowly after  
824 spraying. *Journal of Applied Ecology*, 56(9), 2176–2185. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2664.13452>

825 Garratt, M. P. D., Senapathi, D., Coston, D. J., Mortimer, S. R., & Potts, S. G. (2017). The benefits of  
826 hedgerows for pollinators and natural enemies depends on hedge quality and landscape context.  
827 *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment*, 247, 363–370. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2017.06.048>

828 Garratt, M. P. D., Wright, D. J., & Leather, S. R. (2011). The effects of farming system and fertilisers  
829 on pests and natural enemies: A synthesis of current research. *Agriculture, Ecosystems &*  
830 *Environment*, 141(3–4), 261–270. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2011.03.014>

831 González, E., Bianchi, F. J. J. A., Eckerter, P. W., Pfaff, V., Weiler, S., & Entling, M. H. (2022). Ecological  
832 requirements drive the variable responses of wheat pests and natural enemies to the landscape  
833 context. *Journal of Applied Ecology*, 59(2), 444–456. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2664.14062>

834 Gov.UK. (2018). *A Green Future: Our 25 Year Plan to Improve the Environment*.  
835 [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/693158/25-year-environment-plan.pdf)  
836 [/693158/25-year-environment-plan.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/693158/25-year-environment-plan.pdf)

837 Gov.UK. (2021, May 18). *Nature for people, climate and wildlife Published 18 May 2021* [Online  
838 post]. [https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/nature-for-people-climate-and-wildlife/nature-](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/nature-for-people-climate-and-wildlife/nature-for-people-climate-and-wildlife)  
839 [for-people-climate-and-wildlife](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/nature-for-people-climate-and-wildlife/nature-for-people-climate-and-wildlife)

840 Gov.UK. (2023a). *Environmental Improvement Plan 2023: First revision of the 25 Year Environment*  
841 *Plan* (p. 262). Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs.  
842 <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/environmental-improvement-plan>

843 Gov.UK. (2023b). *Environmental Land Management (ELM) update: How government will pay for*  
844 *land-based environment and climate goods and services* (p. 140) [Policy paper].  
845 <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/environmental-land-management-update-how->

846 government-will-pay-for-land-based-environment-and-climate-goods-and-services/environmental-  
847 land-management-elm-update-how-government-will-pay-for-land-based-environment-and-climate-  
848 goods-and-services

849 Gov.UK. (2024). *Guidance Applicant's guide: Capital Grants 2023* (Rural Payments Agency, p. 39)  
850 [Guidance]. [https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/capital-grants-2023-countryside-](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/capital-grants-2023-countryside-stewardship/applicants-guide-capital-grants-2023#about-capital-grants)  
851 [stewardship/applicants-guide-capital-grants-2023#about-capital-grants](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/capital-grants-2023-countryside-stewardship/applicants-guide-capital-grants-2023#about-capital-grants)

852 Gov.UK. (2025a). *BE3: Management of hedgerows*. Rural Payments Agency and Natural England.  
853 <https://www.gov.uk/countryside-stewardship-grants/management-of-hedgerows-be3>

854 Gov.UK. (2025b). *Funding and grants for agroforestry* [Guidance].  
855 [https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/funding-and-grants-for-agroforestry/funding-and-](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/funding-and-grants-for-agroforestry/funding-and-grants-for-agroforestry)  
856 [grants-for-agroforestry](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/funding-and-grants-for-agroforestry/funding-and-grants-for-agroforestry)

857 Gov.UK. (2025c). *Planting new hedges* (Countryside Stewardship Grant Finder BN11). Rural  
858 Payments Agency and Natural England. [https://www.gov.uk/countryside-stewardship-](https://www.gov.uk/countryside-stewardship-grants/planting-new-hedges-bn11)  
859 [grants/planting-new-hedges-bn11](https://www.gov.uk/countryside-stewardship-grants/planting-new-hedges-bn11)

860 Gov.UK. (2025d). *Woodland Creation Planning Grant* [Guidance].  
861 <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/woodland-creation-planning-grant>

862 Graham, L., Gaulton, R., Gerard, F., & Staley, J. T. (2018). The influence of hedgerow structural  
863 condition on wildlife habitat provision in farmed landscapes. *Biological Conservation*, 220, 122–131.  
864 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2018.02.017>

865 Greenop, A., Cecelja, A., Woodcock, B. A., Wilby, A., Cook, S. M., & Pywell, R. F. (2019). Two common  
866 invertebrate predators show varying predation responses to different types of sentinel prey. *Journal*  
867 *of Applied Entomology*, 143(4), 380–386. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jen.12612>

868 Greenop, A., Cook, S. M., Wilby, A., Pywell, R. F., & Woodcock, B. A. (2020). Invertebrate community  
869 structure predicts natural pest control resilience to insecticide exposure. *Journal of Applied Ecology*,  
870 57(12), 2441–2453. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2664.13752>

871 Greenop, A., Woodcock, B. A., Wilby, A., Cook, S. M., & Pywell, R. F. (2018). Functional diversity  
872 positively affects prey suppression by invertebrate predators: A meta-analysis. *Ecology*, 99(8), 1771–  
873 1782. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ecy.2378>

874 Griffiths, J., Phillips, D. S., Compton, S. G., Wright, C., & Incoll, L. D. (1998). Responses of slug  
875 numbers and slug damage to crops in a silvoarable agroforestry landscape. *Journal of Applied*  
876 *Ecology*, 35(2), 252–260. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2664.1998.00291.x>

877 Grigoriadis, V., Gold, E., Hutchinson, G., Frewer, L. J., Brereton, P., Flannery, D., Byrne, K. A., &  
878 Garvey, J. (2023). How financial mechanisms can incentivize provision of ecosystem services from  
879 land restoration: A systematic review protocol. *PLOS ONE*, 18(7), e0289120.  
880 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0289120>

881 Guedes, R. N. C., Smagghe, G., Stark, J. D., & Desneux, N. (2016). Pesticide-Induced Stress in  
882 Arthropod Pests for Optimized Integrated Pest Management Programs. *Annual Review of*  
883 *Entomology*, 61(1), 43–62. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-ento-010715-023646>

884 Gurr, G. M., Wratten, S. D., Landis, D. A., & You, M. (2017). Habitat Management to Suppress Pest  
885 Populations: Progress and Prospects. *Annual Review of Entomology*, 62(1), 91–109.  
886 <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-ento-031616-035050>

887 Haaland, C., Naisbit, R. E., & Bersier, L.-F. (2011). Sown wildflower strips for insect conservation: A  
888 review: Wildflower strips for insect conservation. *Insect Conservation and Diversity*, 4(1), 60–80.  
889 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1752-4598.2010.00098.x>

890 Harrison, S., Ryan, C., Gassner, A., & Harrison, R. D. (2021). *The Farmland Biodiversity Score for*  
891 *consistent monitoring of biodiversity based on the measurement of trees on farms*. ICRAF Working  
892 Paper No. 321, World Agroforestry. <https://doi.org/10.5716/WP21038.PDF>

893 Hatt, S., Boeraeve, F., Artru, S., Dufrêne, M., & Francis, F. (2018). Spatial diversification of  
894 agroecosystems to enhance biological control and other regulating services: An agroecological  
895 perspective. *Science of The Total Environment*, 621, 600–611.  
896 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2017.11.296>

897 Hauggaard-Nielsen, H., Lund, S., Aare, A. K., Watson, C. A., Bedoussac, L., Aubertot, J.-N.,  
898 Chongtham, I., Bellostas, N., Topp, C. F. E., Hohmann, P., Jensen, E. S., Stadel, M., Pinel, B., & Justes,  
899 E. (2021). Translating the multiactor approach to research into practice using a workshop approach  
900 focusing on species mixtures. *Frontiers of Agricultural Science and Engineering*, 8(3), 460–473.  
901 <https://doi.org/10.15302/J-FASE-2021416>

902 Helepciuc, F.-E., & Todor, A. (2022). Evaluating the EU’s efforts to improve resilience to health and  
903 environmental risks associated with pesticide use by analyzing the national action plans of EU  
904 member states from 2009 to 2019. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public*  
905 *Health*, 19(9), 5446. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph19095446>

906 Hill, L. (2016). Predicted abundance maps for British Trees. University of Oxford. *University of Oxford*.  
907 <https://ora.ox.ac.uk/objects/uuid:c381f783-7eaa-4be6-9788-c197c74b2953>

908 Hill, L., Hector, A., Hemery, G., Smart, S., Tanadini, M., & Brown, N. (2017). Abundance distributions  
909 for tree species in Great Britain: A two-stage approach to modeling abundance using species  
910 distribution modeling and random forest. *Ecology and Evolution*, 7(4), 1043–1056.  
911 <https://doi.org/10.1002/ece3.2661>

912 Holland, J. M., Bianchi, F. J., Entling, M. H., Moonen, A.-C., Smith, B. M., & Jeanneret, P. (2016).  
913 Structure, function and management of semi-natural habitats for conservation biological control: A  
914 review of European studies: Structure, function and management of semi-natural habitats for  
915 biological control. *Pest Management Science*, 72(9), 1638–1651. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ps.4318>

916 Holland, J. M., McHugh, N. M., & Salinari, F. (2021). Field specific monitoring of cereal yellow dwarf  
917 virus aphid vectors and factors influencing their immigration within fields. *Pest Management*  
918 *Science*, 77(9), 4100–4108. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ps.6435>

919 Holland, J. M., Storkey, J., Lutman, P. J. W., Henderson, I., & Orson, J. (2013). *Managing uncropped*  
920 *land in order to enhance biodiversity benefits of the arable farmed landscape: The Farm4bio project*.  
921 (No.508). HGCA-AHDB.  
922 [https://projectblue.blob.core.windows.net/media/Default/Research%20Papers/Cereals%20and%20](https://projectblue.blob.core.windows.net/media/Default/Research%20Papers/Cereals%20and%20Oilseed/pr508.pdf)  
923 [Oilseed/pr508.pdf](https://projectblue.blob.core.windows.net/media/Default/Research%20Papers/Cereals%20and%20Oilseed/pr508.pdf)

924 Howard, C., Fountain, M. T., Brittain, C., Burgess, P. J., & Garratt, M. P. D. (2024). Perennial flower  
925 margins reduce orchard fruit damage by rosy apple aphid, *Dysaphis plantaginea* (Homoptera:  
926 Aphididae). *Journal of Applied Ecology*, 1365-2664.14598. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2664.14598>

927 Høye, T. T., Ärje, J., Bjerger, K., Hansen, O. L. P., Iosifidis, A., Leese, F., Mann, H. M. R., Meissner, K.,  
928 Melvad, C., & Raitoharju, J. (2021). Deep learning and computer vision will transform entomology.

929 *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 118(2), e2002545117.  
 930 <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2002545117>

931 HSE. (2021). *Regulating pesticides in the UK after Brexit* [Online post]. Health and Safety Executive.  
 932 <https://www.hse.gov.uk/pesticides/brexit.htm#changes>

933 Hsu, C.-C., & Sandford, B. A. (2007). The Delphi Technique: Making Sense of Consensus. *Practical*  
 934 *Assessment, Research, and Evaluation*, 12(1), 10. <https://doi.org/10.7275/PDZ9-TH90>

935 Hunter, F., Ditchburn, B., Burns, N., & Strong, C. (2025). *NCEA: National Trees Outside Woodland*  
 936 *(TOW) V1 map* [Method and user guide]. Forest Research.  
 937 [https://ncea.maps.arcgis.com/apps/instant/sidebar/index.html?appid=cf571f455b444e588aa94bbd](https://ncea.maps.arcgis.com/apps/instant/sidebar/index.html?appid=cf571f455b444e588aa94bbd22021cd3)  
 938 [22021cd3](https://ncea.maps.arcgis.com/apps/instant/sidebar/index.html?appid=cf571f455b444e588aa94bbd22021cd3)

939 IBMA. (2021). *IBMA position on revisions to the directive for the sustainable use of pesticides (SUD)*.  
 940 [https://ibma-global.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/03/IBMA-SUD-Directive-Position-Paper-](https://ibma-global.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/03/IBMA-SUD-Directive-Position-Paper-Final.pdf?utm_source=newsletter&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=ibma_press_release_sud_review_bioprotection_biocontrol_technologies_make_a_crucial_contribution_to_the_transition_to_more_agroecological_farming&utm_term=2021-04-01)  
 941 [Final.pdf?utm\\_source=newsletter&utm\\_medium=email&utm\\_campaign=ibma\\_press\\_release\\_sud\\_r](https://ibma-global.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/03/IBMA-SUD-Directive-Position-Paper-Final.pdf?utm_source=newsletter&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=ibma_press_release_sud_review_bioprotection_biocontrol_technologies_make_a_crucial_contribution_to_the_transition_to_more_agroecological_farming&utm_term=2021-04-01)  
 942 [eview\\_bioprotection\\_biocontrol\\_technologies\\_make\\_a\\_crucial\\_contribution\\_to\\_the\\_transition\\_to\\_](https://ibma-global.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/03/IBMA-SUD-Directive-Position-Paper-Final.pdf?utm_source=newsletter&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=ibma_press_release_sud_review_bioprotection_biocontrol_technologies_make_a_crucial_contribution_to_the_transition_to_more_agroecological_farming&utm_term=2021-04-01)  
 943 [more\\_agroecological\\_farming&utm\\_term=2021-04-01](https://ibma-global.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/03/IBMA-SUD-Directive-Position-Paper-Final.pdf?utm_source=newsletter&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=ibma_press_release_sud_review_bioprotection_biocontrol_technologies_make_a_crucial_contribution_to_the_transition_to_more_agroecological_farming&utm_term=2021-04-01)

944 Ingram, J. S. I., Wright, H. L., Foster, L., Aldred, T., Barling, D., Benton, T. G., Berryman, P. M.,  
 945 Bestwick, C. S., Bows-Larkin, A., Brocklehurst, T. F., Buttriss, J., Casey, J., Collins, H., Crossley, D. S.,  
 946 Dolan, C. S., Dowler, E., Edwards, R., Finney, K. J., Fitzpatrick, J. L., ... Sutherland, W. J. (2013). Priority  
 947 research questions for the UK food system. *Food Security*, 5(5), 617–636.  
 948 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12571-013-0294-4>

949 IPMWORKS. (2024). *IPMWORKS Resource Toolbox* [Computer software].  
 950 <https://ipmworks.net/toolbox/en/#/>

951 Iuliano, B., & Gratton, C. (2020). Temporal Resource (Dis)continuity for Conservation Biological  
 952 Control: From Field to Landscape Scales. *Frontiers in Sustainable Food Systems*, 4, 127.  
 953 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fsufs.2020.00127>

954 Ivezić, V., Yu, Y., & Werf, W. V. D. (2021). Crop Yields in European Agroforestry Systems: A Meta-  
 955 Analysis. *Frontiers in Sustainable Food Systems*, 5, 606631.  
 956 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fsufs.2021.606631>

957 Jacobs, S., Burkhard, B., Van Daele, T., Staes, J., & Schneiders, A. (2015). ‘The Matrix Reloaded’: A  
 958 review of expert knowledge use for mapping ecosystem services. *Ecological Modelling*, 295, 21–30.  
 959 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolmodel.2014.08.024>

960 Johnson, A. C., Liu, J., Reynolds, O., Furlong, M. J., Mo, J., Rizvi, S., & Gurr, G. M. (2021). Conservation  
 961 biological control research is strongly uneven across trophic levels and economic measures. *Pest*  
 962 *Management Science*, 77(5), 2165–2169. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ps.6162>

963 Jonsson, M., Kaartinen, R., & Straub, C. S. (2017). Relationships between natural enemy diversity and  
 964 biological control. *Current Opinion in Insect Science*, 20, 1–6.  
 965 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cois.2017.01.001>

966 Karolewski, P., Giertych, M. J., Żmuda, M., Jagodziński, A. M., & Oleksyn, J. (2013). Season and light  
 967 affect constitutive defenses of understory shrub species against folivorous insects. *Acta Oecologica*,  
 968 53, 19–32. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actao.2013.08.004>

969 Kletty, F., Rozan, A., & Habel, C. (2023). Biodiversity in temperate silvoarable systems: A systematic  
970 review. *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment*, 351, 108480.  
971 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2023.108480>

972 Knapp, M., Seidl, M., Knappová, J., Macek, M., & Saska, P. (2019). Temporal changes in the spatial  
973 distribution of carabid beetles around arable field-woodlot boundaries. *Scientific Reports*, 9(1), 8967.  
974 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-019-45378-7>

975 Krueger, T., Page, T., Hubacek, K., Smith, L., & Hiscock, K. (2012). The role of expert opinion in  
976 environmental modelling. *Environmental Modelling & Software*, 36, 4–18.  
977 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsoft.2012.01.011>

978 Kuyah, S., Öborn, I., Jonsson, M., Dahlin, A. S., Barrios, E., Muthuri, C., Malmer, A., Nyaga, J., Magaju,  
979 C., Namirembe, S., Nyberg, Y., & Sinclair, F. L. (2016). Trees in agricultural landscapes enhance  
980 provision of ecosystem services in Sub-Saharan Africa. *International Journal of Biodiversity Science,  
981 Ecosystem Services & Management*, 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21513732.2016.1214178>

982 Lamichhane, J. R., Akbas, B., Andreasen, C. B., Arendse, W., Bluemel, S., Dachbrodt-Saaydeh, S.,  
983 Fuchs, A., Jansen, J.-P., Kiss, J., Kudsk, P., Malet, J.-C., Masci, A., de la Peña, A., Willener, A. S. T., &  
984 Messéan, A. (2018). A call for stakeholders to boost integrated pest management in Europe: A vision  
985 based on the three-year European research area network project. *International Journal of Pest  
986 Management*, 64(4), 352–358. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09670874.2018.1435924>

987 Lamichhane, J. R., Bischoff-Schaefer, M., Bluemel, S., Dachbrodt-Saaydeh, S., Dreux, L., Jansen, J.-P.,  
988 Kiss, J., Köhl, J., Kudsk, P., Malausa, T., Messéan, A., Nicot, P. C., Ricci, P., Thibierge, J., & Villeneuve,  
989 F. (2017). Identifying obstacles and ranking common biological control research priorities for Europe  
990 to manage most economically important pests in arable, vegetable and perennial crops: Pest  
991 management in arable, vegetable and perennial crops in Europe. *Pest Management Science*, 73(1),  
992 14–21. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ps.4423>

993 Lawson, G., Muraru, C., Bertomeu, M., & Corbacho, J. (2024). *Defining Forests and Agroforests in the  
994 EU*. (Policy Note 15 version 5). EURAF. <https://zenodo.org/records/14161921>

995 LEAF. (2024). *LEAF Network Demonstration Farms* [Online post]. [https://leaf.eco/farming/leaf-](https://leaf.eco/farming/leaf-network)  
996 network

997 Lee, J. C., Dreves, A. J., Cave, A. M., Kawai, S., Isaacs, R., Miller, J. C., Van Timmeren, S., & Bruck, D. J.  
998 (2015). Infestation of Wild and Ornamental Noncrop Fruits by *Drosophila suzukii* (Diptera:  
999 Drosophilidae). *Annals of the Entomological Society of America*, 108(2), 117–129.  
1000 <https://doi.org/10.1093/aesa/sau014>

1001 Longley, M., & Sotherton, N. W. (1997). Measurements of pesticide spray drift deposition into field  
1002 boundaries and hedgerows: 2. Autumn applications. *Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry*, 16(2),  
1003 173–178. <https://doi.org/10.1002/etc.5620160211>

1004 Losey, J. E., & Vaughan, M. (2006). The economic value of ecological services provided by insects.  
1005 *BioScience*, 56(4), 311. [https://doi.org/10.1641/0006-3568\(2006\)56\[311:TEVOES\]2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1641/0006-3568(2006)56[311:TEVOES]2.0.CO;2)

1006 Lövei, G. L., & Ferrante, M. (2017). A review of the sentinel prey method as a way of quantifying  
1007 invertebrate predation under field conditions: Measuring predation pressure by sentinel prey. *Insect  
1008 Science*, 24(4), 528–542. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1744-7917.12405>

1009 Marshall, E. J. P. (2004). Agricultural Landscapes: Field Margin Habitats and Their Interaction with  
 1010 Crop Production. *Journal of Crop Improvement*, 12(1–2), 365–404.  
 1011 [https://doi.org/10.1300/J411v12n01\\_05](https://doi.org/10.1300/J411v12n01_05)

1012 Marshall, E. J. P., West, T. M., & Kleijn, D. (2006). Impacts of an agri-environment field margin  
 1013 prescription on the flora and fauna of arable farmland in different landscapes. *Agriculture,*  
 1014 *Ecosystems & Environment*, 113(1–4), 36–44. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2005.08.036>

1015 Martin, E. A., Dainese, M., Clough, Y., Báldi, A., Bommarco, R., Gagic, V., Garratt, M. P. D., Holzschuh,  
 1016 A., Kleijn, D., Kovács-Hostyánszki, A., Marini, L., Potts, S. G., Smith, H. G., Al Hassan, D., Albrecht, M.,  
 1017 Andersson, G. K. S., Asís, J. D., Aviron, S., Balzan, M. V., ... Steffan-Dewenter, I. (2019). The interplay  
 1018 of landscape composition and configuration: New pathways to manage functional biodiversity and  
 1019 agroecosystem services across Europe. *Ecology Letters*, 22(7), 1083–1094.  
 1020 <https://doi.org/10.1111/ele.13265>

1021 McHugh, N. M., Moreby, S., Lof, M. E., Werf, W., & Holland, J. M. (2020). The contribution of semi-  
 1022 natural habitats to biological control is dependent on sentinel prey type. *Journal of Applied Ecology*,  
 1023 57(5), 914–925. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2664.13596>

1024 Ministry for Primary Industries. (2024). *Biosecurity New Zealand: Report a pest or disease* [Online  
 1025 post]. [https://www.mpi.govt.nz/biosecurity/how-to-find-report-and-prevent-pests-and-](https://www.mpi.govt.nz/biosecurity/how-to-find-report-and-prevent-pests-and-diseases/search-for-a-pest-or-disease)  
 1026 [diseases/search-for-a-pest-or-disease](https://www.mpi.govt.nz/biosecurity/how-to-find-report-and-prevent-pests-and-diseases/search-for-a-pest-or-disease)

1027 Montgomery, I., Caruso, T., & Reid, N. (2020). Hedgerows as Ecosystems: Service Delivery,  
 1028 Management, and Restoration. *Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics*, 51(1), 81–102.  
 1029 <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-ecolsys-012120-100346>

1030 Morales-Rodríguez, C., Anslan, S., Auger-Rozenberg, M.-A., Augustin, S., Baranchikov, Y., Bellahirech,  
 1031 A., Burokienė, D., Čepukoit, D., Çota, E., Davydenko, K., Doğmuş Lehtijärvi, H. T., Drenkhan, R.,  
 1032 Drenkhan, T., Eschen, R., Franić, I., Glavendekić, M., De Groot, M., Kacprzyk, M., Kenis, M., ... Cleary,  
 1033 M. (2019). Forewarned is forearmed: Harmonized approaches for early detection of potentially  
 1034 invasive pests and pathogens in sentinel plantings. *NeoBiota*, 47, 95–123.  
 1035 <https://doi.org/10.3897/neobiota.47.34276>

1036 Morandin, L. A., Long, R. F., & Kremen, C. (2014). Hedgerows enhance beneficial insects on adjacent  
 1037 tomato fields in an intensive agricultural landscape. *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment*, 189,  
 1038 164–170. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2014.03.030>

1039 Mumford, J. D., Gullino, M. L., Stack, J. P., Fletcher, J., & Quinlan, M. M. (2017). The Need for  
 1040 International Perspectives to Solve Global Biosecurity Challenges. In M. L. Gullino, J. P. Stack, J.  
 1041 Fletcher, & J. D. Mumford (Eds.), *Practical Tools for Plant and Food Biosecurity* (pp. 363–384).  
 1042 Springer International Publishing. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-46897-6\\_18](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-46897-6_18)

1043 Nagy, R. K., Schellhorn, N. A., & Zalucki, M. P. (2020). Fresh, frozen or fake: A comparison of  
 1044 predation rates measured by various types of sentinel prey. *Journal of Applied Entomology*, 144(5),  
 1045 407–416. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jen.12745>

1046 Natural England and RSPB. (2019). *Climate Change Adaptation Manual—Evidence to support nature*  
 1047 *conservation in a changing climate* (Second edition; p. 582). Natural England.  
 1048 <https://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/publication/5679197848862720>

1049 Natural Resources Wales. (2020). *The Second State of Natural Resources Report (SoNaRR2020):*  
 1050 *Register enclosed farmland evidence. Natural Resources Wales Final Report.*  
 1051 <https://naturalresources.wales/media/692885/sonarr2020-register-enclosed-farmland-evidence.pdf>  
 1052 NFU. (2023). *IPM Tool: Create IPM plans for your farm* [Online post]. <https://ipmtool.net/>  
 1053 Panzavolta, T., Bracalini, M., Benigno, A., & Moricca, S. (2021). Alien Invasive Pathogens and Pests  
 1054 Harming Trees, Forests, and Plantations: Pathways, Global Consequences and Management. *Forests*,  
 1055 12(10), 1364. <https://doi.org/10.3390/f12101364>  
 1056 Pearce-Higgins, J. W., Beale, C. M., Oliver, T. H., August, T. A., Carroll, M., Massimino, D., Ockendon,  
 1057 N., Savage, J., Wheatley, C. J., Ausden, M. A., Bradbury, R. B., Duffield, S. J., Macgregor, N. A.,  
 1058 McClean, C. J., Morecroft, M. D., Thomas, C. D., Watts, O., Beckmann, B. C., Fox, R., ... Crick, H. Q. P.  
 1059 (2017). A national-scale assessment of climate change impacts on species: Assessing the balance of  
 1060 risks and opportunities for multiple taxa. *Biological Conservation*, 213, 124–134.  
 1061 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2017.06.035>  
 1062 Peñalver-Cruz, A., Alvarez, D., & Lavandero, B. (2020). Do hedgerows influence the natural biological  
 1063 control of woolly apple aphids in orchards? *Journal of Pest Science*, 93(1), 219–234.  
 1064 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10340-019-01153-1>  
 1065 Perović, D. J., Gámez-Virués, S., Landis, D. A., Wäckers, F., Gurr, G. M., Wratten, S. D., You, M.-S., &  
 1066 Desneux, N. (2018). Managing biological control services through multi-trophic trait interactions:  
 1067 Review and guidelines for implementation at local and landscape scales: Multi-trophic traits & multi-  
 1068 scale filters. *Biological Reviews*, 93(1), 306–321. <https://doi.org/10.1111/brv.12346>  
 1069 Pichersky, E., & Raguso, R. A. (2018). Why do plants produce so many terpenoid compounds? *New*  
 1070 *Phytologist*, 220(3), 692–702. <https://doi.org/10.1111/nph.14178>  
 1071 Pretty, J., Sutherland, W. J., Ashby, J., Auburn, J., Baulcombe, D., Bell, M., Bentley, J., Bickersteth, S.,  
 1072 Brown, K., Burke, J., Campbell, H., Chen, K., Crowley, E., Crute, I., Dobbelaere, D., Edwards-Jones, G.,  
 1073 Funes-Monzote, F., Godfray, H. C. J., Griffon, M., ... Pilgrim, S. (2010). The top 100 questions of  
 1074 importance to the future of global agriculture. *International Journal of Agricultural Sustainability*,  
 1075 8(4), 219–236. <https://doi.org/10.3763/ijas.2010.0534>  
 1076 Pywell, R. F., James, K. L., Herbert, I., Meek, W. R., Carvell, C., Bell, D., & Sparks, T. H. (2005).  
 1077 Determinants of overwintering habitat quality for beetles and spiders on arable farmland. *Biological*  
 1078 *Conservation*, 123(1), 79–90. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2004.10.010>  
 1079 Ramos Aguila, L. C., Li, X., Akutse, K. S., Bamisile, B. S., Sánchez Moreano, J. P., Lie, Z., & Liu, J. (2023).  
 1080 Host–Parasitoid Phenology, Distribution, and Biological Control under Climate Change. *Life*, 13(12),  
 1081 2290. <https://doi.org/10.3390/life13122290>  
 1082 Raskin, B., & Osborn, S. (2019). *The agroforestry handbook: Agroforestry for the UK* (1st ed.). Soil  
 1083 Association Limited. <https://www.soilassociation.org/media/19141/the-agroforestry-handbook.pdf>  
 1084 Redhead, J. W., Oliver, T. H., Woodcock, B. A., & Pywell, R. F. (2020). The influence of landscape  
 1085 composition and configuration on crop yield resilience. *Journal of Applied Ecology*, 57(11), 2180–  
 1086 2190. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2664.13722>  
 1087 Rhodes, M. W., Bennie, J. J., Spalding, A., ffrench-Constant, R. H., & Maclean, I. M. D. (2022). Recent  
 1088 advances in the remote sensing of insects. *Biological Reviews*, 97(1), 343–360.  
 1089 <https://doi.org/10.1111/brv.12802>

1090 Ricci, B., Lavigne, C., Alignier, A., Aviron, S., Biju-Duval, L., Bouvier, J. C., Choisis, J.-P., Franck, P.,  
1091 Joannon, A., Ladet, S., Mezerette, F., Plantegenest, M., Savary, G., Thomas, C., Vialatte, A., & Petit, S.  
1092 (2019). Local pesticide use intensity conditions landscape effects on biological pest control.  
1093 *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 286(1904), 20182898.  
1094 <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2018.2898>

1095 RIS. (2022). *The Insect Survey: Rothamsted Insect Survey Online Database* [Computer software].  
1096 Rothamsted Research. [https://repository.rothamsted.ac.uk/item/987q7/rothamsted-insect-survey-](https://repository.rothamsted.ac.uk/item/987q7/rothamsted-insect-survey-online-database)  
1097 [online-database](https://repository.rothamsted.ac.uk/item/987q7/rothamsted-insect-survey-online-database)

1098 Roncoli, C. (2006). Ethnographic and participatory approaches to research on farmers responses to  
1099 climate predictions. *Climate Research*, 33, 81–99. <https://doi.org/10.3354/cr033081>

1100 Sánchez-Bayo. (2012). Insecticides Mode of Action in Relation to Their Toxicity to Non-Target  
1101 Organisms. *Journal of Environmental & Analytical Toxicology*, s4. [https://doi.org/10.4172/2161-](https://doi.org/10.4172/2161-0525.S4-002)  
1102 [0525.S4-002](https://doi.org/10.4172/2161-0525.S4-002)

1103 Saunders, M. E., & Luck, G. W. (2014). Spatial and temporal variation in pollinator community  
1104 structure relative to a woodland-almond plantation edge. *Agricultural and Forest Entomology*, 16(4),  
1105 369–381. <https://doi.org/10.1111/afe.12067>

1106 Schneider, S., Taylor, G. W., Kremer, S. C., & Fryxell, J. M. (2023). Getting the bugs out of AI:  
1107 Advancing ecological research on arthropods through computer vision. *Ecology Letters*, 26(7), 1247–  
1108 1258. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ele.14239>

1109 Shepard, E. L. C., Wilson, R. P., Rees, W. G., Grundy, E., Lambertucci, S. A., & Vosper, S. B. (2013).  
1110 Energy Landscapes Shape Animal Movement Ecology. *The American Naturalist*, 182(3), 298–312.  
1111 <https://doi.org/10.1086/671257>

1112 Sinclair, F. L. (1999). A general classification of agroforestry practice. *Agroforestry Systems*, 46(2),  
1113 161–180. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1006278928088>

1114 Singh, A., MacGowan, B., O'Donnell, M., Overstreet, B., Ulrich-Schad, J., Dunn, M., Klotz, H., &  
1115 Prokopy, L. (2018). The influence of demonstration sites and field days on adoption of conservation  
1116 practices. *Journal of Soil and Water Conservation*, 73(3), 276 LP – 283.  
1117 <https://doi.org/10.2489/jswc.73.3.276>

1118 Singh, S. R., Walters, K. F. A., & Port, G. R. (2001). Behaviour of the adult seven spot ladybird,  
1119 *Coccinella septempunctata* (Coleoptera: Coccinellidae), in response to dimethoate residue on bean  
1120 plants in the laboratory. *Bulletin of Entomological Research*, 91(3), 221–226.  
1121 <https://doi.org/10.1079/BER200187>

1122 Singh, S. R., Walters, K. F. A., Port, G. R., & Northing, P. (2004). Consumption rates and predatory  
1123 activity of adult and fourth instar larvae of the seven spot ladybird, *Coccinella septempunctata* (L.),  
1124 following contact with dimethoate residue and contaminated prey in laboratory arenas. *Biological*  
1125 *Control*, 30(2), 127–133. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocontrol.2004.01.003>

1126 Skendžić, S., Zovko, M., Živković, I. P., Lešić, V., & Lemić, D. (2021). The Impact of Climate Change on  
1127 Agricultural Insect Pests. *Insects*, 12(5), 440. <https://doi.org/10.3390/insects12050440>

1128 Smith, A. C. A., Baker, J. B., Berry, P. M. A., Butterworth, T. C., Chapman, A. E., Harle, T. E., Heaver,  
1129 M. F., Hölzinger, O. C., Howard, B. G., Norton, L. R. H., Rice, P. E., & Scott, A. I. (2021). *Environmental*  
1130 *Benefits from Nature (EBN) Tool – User Guide (Beta Version, July 2021)*. (Natural England Joint

1131 Publication JP038; p. 46). University of Oxford A – Balfour Beatty, B – WSP, C – Natural England E –  
 1132 Department for Environment and Rural Affairs F – Ecosystems Knowledge Network G – Centre for  
 1133 Ecology & Hydrology, H. University of Northumbria, I.  
 1134 <https://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/publication/6414097026646016>

1135 Sponagel, C., Klinnert, A., Catarino, R., Beber, C. L., Baldoni, E., Barbosa, A.-L., Witte, F., Bahrs, E., &  
 1136 Fellmann, T. (2025). Capturing the effects of flower strips on natural pest control in agronomic land  
 1137 use models. *Agricultural Systems*, 222, 104176. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agsy.2024.104176>

1138 Stafford, J. V. (2000). Implementing Precision Agriculture in the 21st Century. *Journal of Agricultural*  
 1139 *Engineering Research*, 76(3), 267–275. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jaer.2000.0577>

1140 Staley, J. T., Botham, M. S., Chapman, R. E., Amy, S. R., Heard, M. S., Hulmes, L., Savage, J., & Pywell,  
 1141 R. F. (2016). Little and late: How reduced hedgerow cutting can benefit Lepidoptera. *Agriculture,*  
 1142 *Ecosystems & Environment*, 224, 22–28. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2016.03.018>

1143 Staley, J. T., Sparks, T. H., Croxton, P. J., Baldock, K. C. R., Heard, M. S., Hulmes, S., Hulmes, L.,  
 1144 Peyton, J., Amy, S. R., & Pywell, R. F. (2012). Long-term effects of hedgerow management policies on  
 1145 resource provision for wildlife. *Biological Conservation*, 145(1), 24–29.  
 1146 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2011.09.006>

1147 Staton, T., Beauchamp, K., Broome, A., & Breeze, T. (2024). *Tree Species Guide for UK Agroforestry*  
 1148 *Systems* (p. 88). Forest Research.

1149 Staton, T., Walters, R. J., Smith, J., Breeze, T. D., & Girling, R. D. (2021a). Evaluating a trait-based  
 1150 approach to compare natural enemy and pest communities in agroforestry vs. Arable systems.  
 1151 *Ecological Applications*, 31(4). <https://doi.org/10.1002/eap.2294>

1152 Staton, T., Walters, R. J., Smith, J., & Girling, R. D. (2019). Evaluating the effects of integrating trees  
 1153 into temperate arable systems on pest control and pollination. *Agricultural Systems*, 176, 102676.  
 1154 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agsy.2019.102676>

1155 Staton, T., Walters, R., Smith, J., Breeze, T., & Girling, R. (2021b). Management to Promote Flowering  
 1156 Understoreys Benefits Natural Enemy Diversity, Aphid Suppression and Income in an Agroforestry  
 1157 System. *Agronomy*, 11(4), 651. <https://doi.org/10.3390/agronomy11040651>

1158 Stephens, D. W., Brown, J. S., & Ydenberg, R. C. (2007). *Foraging: Behaviour and Ecology*. University  
 1159 of Chicago Press.

1160 Stevens, C. J., David, T. I., & Storkey, J. (2018). Atmospheric nitrogen deposition in terrestrial  
 1161 ecosystems: Its impact on plant communities and consequences across trophic levels. *Functional*  
 1162 *Ecology*, 32(7), 1757–1769. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2435.13063>

1163 Suprunenko, Y. F., Cornell, S. J., & Gilligan, C. A. (2021). Analytical approximation for invasion and  
 1164 endemic thresholds, and the optimal control of epidemics in spatially explicit individual-based  
 1165 models. *Journal of The Royal Society Interface*, 18(176), rsif.2020.0966, 20200966.  
 1166 <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsif.2020.0966>

1167 Sutherland, W. J., Bellingan, L., Bellingham, J. R., Blackstock, J. J., Bloomfield, R. M., Bravo, M.,  
 1168 Cadman, V. M., Cleevely, D. D., Clements, A., Cohen, A. S., Cope, D. R., Daemmrich, A. A., Devecchi,  
 1169 C., Anadon, L. D., Denegri, S., Doubleday, R., Dusic, N. R., Evans, R. J., Feng, W. Y., ... Zimmern, R. L.  
 1170 (2012). A Collaboratively-Derived Science-Policy Research Agenda. *PLoS ONE*, 7(3), e31824.  
 1171 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0031824>

1172 Sylva Foundation. (2023). *myForest* [Online post]. <https://myforest.sylva.org.uk/>

1173 Tamburini, G., Bommarco, R., Wanger, T. C., Kremen, C., Van Der Heijden, M. G. A., Liebman, M., &  
 1174 Hallin, S. (2020). Agricultural diversification promotes multiple ecosystem services without  
 1175 compromising yield. *Science Advances*, 6(45), eaba1715. <https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.aba1715>

1176 Tamburini, G., De Simone, S., Sigura, M., Boscutti, F., & Marini, L. (2016). Conservation tillage  
 1177 mitigates the negative effect of landscape simplification on biological control. *Journal of Applied*  
 1178 *Ecology*, 53(1), 233–241. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2664.12544>

1179 Tamburini, G., Santoiemma, G., E. O'Rourke, M., Bommarco, R., Chaplin-Kramer, R., Dainese, M.,  
 1180 Karp, D. S., Kim, T. N., Martin, E. A., Petersen, M., & Marini, L. (2020). Species traits elucidate crop  
 1181 pest response to landscape composition: A global analysis. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B:*  
 1182 *Biological Sciences*, 287(1937), 20202116. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2020.2116>

1183 TEEB. (2018). *Measuring what matters in agriculture and food systems: A synthesis of the results and*  
 1184 *recommendations of TEEB for Agriculture and Food's Scientific and Economic Foundations report.*  
 1185 The Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity. [http://teebweb.org/our-](http://teebweb.org/our-work/agrifood/reports/measuring-what-matters-synthesis/)  
 1186 [work/agrifood/reports/measuring-what-matters-synthesis/](http://teebweb.org/our-work/agrifood/reports/measuring-what-matters-synthesis/)

1187 The Voluntary Initiative. (2024a). *The Sustainable Use Directive (SUD)*. Integrated Pest Management  
 1188 for sustainable farming. <https://voluntaryinitiative.org.uk/legislation/sustainable-use-directive/>

1189 The Voluntary Initiative. (2024b). *The VI Integrated Pest Management (IPM) Hub; gateway to the*  
 1190 *IPM Plans, IPM Tool and other IPM resources* [On-line].  
 1191 <https://voluntaryinitiative.org.uk/schemes/integrated-pest-management/>

1192 Thornham, D. G., Stamp, C., Walters, K. F. A., Mathers, J. J., Wakefield, M., Blackwell, A., & Evans, K.  
 1193 A. (2007). Feeding responses of adult seven-spotted ladybirds, *Coccinella septempunctata*  
 1194 (Coleoptera, Coccinellidae), to insecticide contaminated prey in laboratory arenas. *Biocontrol Science*  
 1195 *and Technology*, 17(10), 983–994. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09583150701661646>

1196 Tosh, C. R., Staton, T., Costanzo, A., & Simonson, W. (2024). Biotic stress and yield stability in English  
 1197 organic silvoarable agroforestry. *Agronomy for Sustainable Development*, 44(5), 46.  
 1198 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13593-024-00979-z>

1199 Tscharrntke, T., Karp, D. S., Chaplin-Kramer, R., Batáry, P., DeClerck, F., Gratton, C., Hunt, L., Ives, A.,  
 1200 Jonsson, M., Larsen, A., Martin, E. A., Martínez-Salinas, A., Meehan, T. D., O'Rourke, M., Poveda, K.,  
 1201 Rosenheim, J. A., Rusch, A., Schellhorn, N., Wanger, T. C., ... Zhang, W. (2016). When natural habitat  
 1202 fails to enhance biological pest control – Five hypotheses. *Biological Conservation*, 204, 449–458.  
 1203 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2016.10.001>

1204 Tscharrntke, T., Klein, A. M., Kruess, A., Steffan-Dewenter, I., & Thies, C. (2005). Landscape  
 1205 perspectives on agricultural intensification and biodiversity – ecosystem service management.  
 1206 *Ecology Letters*, 8(8), 857–874. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1461-0248.2005.00782.x>

1207 Ucar, T., & Hall, F. R. (2001). Windbreaks as a pesticide drift mitigation strategy: A review. *Pest*  
 1208 *Management Science*, 57(8), 663–675. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ps.341>

1209 Udawatta, R. P., Rankoth, L., & Jose, S. (2019). Agroforestry and biodiversity. *Sustainability*, 11(10),  
 1210 2879. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su11102879>

1211 UKCEH. (2024). *High-tech aerial mapping reveals England's hedgerow landscape.*  
 1212 <https://www.ceh.ac.uk/press/high-tech-aerial-mapping-reveals-englands-hedgerow-landscape>

1213 USDA APHIS. (2022). *Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service U.S. Department of Agriculture:*  
 1214 *Plant Pests and Diseases*. [https://www.aphis.usda.gov/aphis/ourfocus/planthealth/plant-pest-and-](https://www.aphis.usda.gov/aphis/ourfocus/planthealth/plant-pest-and-disease-programs)  
 1215 [disease-programs](https://www.aphis.usda.gov/aphis/ourfocus/planthealth/plant-pest-and-disease-programs)

1216 Van Dijk, L. J. A., Regazzoni, E. D. E., Albrechtsen, B. R., Ehrlén, J., Abdelfattah, A., Stenlund, H.,  
 1217 Pawlowski, K., & Tack, A. J. M. (2022). Single, but not dual, attack by a biotrophic pathogen and a  
 1218 sap-sucking insect affects the oak leaf metabolome. *Frontiers in Plant Science*, *13*, 897186.  
 1219 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2022.897186>

1220 Venette, R. C. (2017). Climate analyses to assess risks from invasive forest insects: Simple matching  
 1221 to advanced models. *Current Forestry Reports*, *3*(3), 255–268. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s40725-017-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s40725-017-0061-4)  
 1222 [0061-4](https://doi.org/10.1007/s40725-017-0061-4)

1223 Walters, K. F. A., Parry, G., Burnstone, J., Grenz, K., Collier, R., & Bruce, T. (2024). Constraints and  
 1224 solutions for development and uptake of integrated pest management in the UK. *Annals of Applied*  
 1225 *Biology*, *185*(2), 146–152. <https://doi.org/10.1111/aab.12896>

1226 Way, M. J., & Cammell, M. E. (1982). The distribution and abundance of the spindle tree, *Euonymus*  
 1227 *europaeus*, in southern England with particular reference to forecasting infestations of the black  
 1228 bean aphid, *Aphis fabae*. *The Journal of Applied Ecology*, *19*(3), 929.  
 1229 <https://doi.org/10.2307/2403294>

1230 Webb, C. R., Avramidis, E., Castle, M. D., Stutt, R. O. H., & Gilligan, C. A. (2023). Modelling the spread  
 1231 of tree pests and pathogens in urban forests. *Urban Forestry & Urban Greening*, *86*, 128036.  
 1232 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ufug.2023.128036>

1233 Wentworth, J. (2023). *Plant biosecurity in Great Britain* [POST]. Parliamentary Office of Science and  
 1234 Technology. <https://doi.org/10.58248/PB51>

1235 Whelan, M. J., Linstead, C., Worrall, F., Ormerod, S. J., Durance, I., Johnson, A. C., Johnson, D., Owen,  
 1236 M., Wiik, E., Howden, N. J. K., Burt, T. P., Boxall, A., Brown, C. D., Oliver, D. M., & Tickner, D. (2022).  
 1237 Is water quality in British rivers “better than at any time since the end of the Industrial Revolution”?  
 1238 *Science of The Total Environment*, *843*, 157014. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2022.157014>

1239 Wojciechowicz-Zytka, E., & Jankowska, B. (2016). *Sambucus nigra* L. as a reservoir of beneficial  
 1240 insects (Diptera, Syrphidae). *Folia Horticulturae*, *28*(2), 209–216. [https://doi.org/10.1515/fhort-](https://doi.org/10.1515/fhort-2016-0025)  
 1241 [2016-0025](https://doi.org/10.1515/fhort-2016-0025)

1242 Wolton, R., Pollard, K., Goodwin, A., & Norton, L. (2014). *Regulatory services delivered by hedges:*  
 1243 *The evidence base—LM0106*. (p. 99) [Report for Defra and Natural England].

1244 Wolz, K. J., Lovell, S. T., Branham, B. E., Eddy, W. C., Keeley, K., Revord, R. S., Wander, M. M., Yang,  
 1245 W. H., & DeLucia, E. H. (2018). Frontiers in alley cropping: Transformative solutions for temperate  
 1246 agriculture. *Global Change Biology*, *24*(3), 883–894. <https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.13986>

1247 Woodcock, B. A., Bullock, J. M., McCracken, M., Chapman, R. E., Ball, S. L., Edwards, M. E.,  
 1248 Nowakowski, M., & Pywell, R. F. (2016). Spill-over of pest control and pollination services into arable  
 1249 crops. *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment*, *231*, 15–23.  
 1250 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2016.06.023>

1251 Woodland Trust. (2024). *A-Z of British trees: British trees from native species to naturalised and*  
 1252 *widely planted non-natives; White Poplar* [Online post]. [https://www.woodlandtrust.org.uk/trees-](https://www.woodlandtrust.org.uk/trees-woods-and-wildlife/british-trees/a-z-of-british-trees/white-poplar/)  
 1253 [woods-and-wildlife/british-trees/a-z-of-british-trees/white-poplar/](https://www.woodlandtrust.org.uk/trees-woods-and-wildlife/british-trees/a-z-of-british-trees/white-poplar/)

1254 Woolford, A. R., & Jarvis, P. E. (2017). *Offsetting land in the agricultural landscape to increase*  
1255 *biodiversity resilience* (Agroecology, p. 23). Game & Wildlife Conservation Trust.  
1256 [https://www.agricology.co.uk/sites/default/files/Off%20setting%20land%20within%20the%20agricu](https://www.agricology.co.uk/sites/default/files/Off%20setting%20land%20within%20the%20agricultural%20landscape%20in%20the%20UK%20FINAL.pdf)  
1257 [ltural%20landscape%20in%20the%20UK%20FINAL.pdf](https://www.agricology.co.uk/sites/default/files/Off%20setting%20land%20within%20the%20agricultural%20landscape%20in%20the%20UK%20FINAL.pdf)

1258 Zverev, V., Zvereva, E. L., & Kozlov, M. V. (2017). Ontogenetic changes in insect herbivory in birch (*Betula pubescens*): The importance of plant apparency. *Functional Ecology*, 31(12), 2224–2232.  
1259 <https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2435.12920>  
1260

1261

## 1262 **Supporting information:**

### 1263 **SI.1 IPM and farmland trees Survey: Dissemination**

1264

### 1265 **SI.2 High level summary of the potential interactions between pests and natural enemies**

1266

### 1267 **SI.3 Web of Science search terms**