



**HAL**  
open science

# Role of insect vectors in epidemiology and invasion risk of *Fusarium circinatum*, and risk assessment of biological control of invasive *Pinus contorta*

Eckehard G. Brockerhoff, Margaret Dick, Rebecca Ganley, Alain Roques,  
Andrew J. Storer

## ► To cite this version:

Eckehard G. Brockerhoff, Margaret Dick, Rebecca Ganley, Alain Roques, Andrew J. Storer. Role of insect vectors in epidemiology and invasion risk of *Fusarium circinatum*, and risk assessment of biological control of invasive *Pinus contorta*. *Biological Invasions*, 2016, 18 (4), pp.1177-1190. 10.1007/s10530-016-1059-8 . hal-02632311

**HAL Id: hal-02632311**

**<https://hal.inrae.fr/hal-02632311>**

Submitted on 27 May 2020

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Copyright

For submission to *Biological Invasions*

**Role of insect vectors in epidemiology and invasion risk of *Fusarium circinatum*, and risk assessment of biological control of invasive *Pinus contorta***

Eckehard G. Brockerhoff, Scion (New Zealand Forest Research Institute), Christchurch, New Zealand, e-mail: [eckehard.brockerhoff@scionresearch.com](mailto:eckehard.brockerhoff@scionresearch.com)

Margaret Dick, Scion (New Zealand Forest Research Institute), Rotorua, New Zealand, e-mail: [margaret.dick@scionresearch.com](mailto:margaret.dick@scionresearch.com)

Rebecca Ganley, Scion (New Zealand Forest Research Institute), Rotorua, New Zealand, e-mail: [rebecca.ganley@scionresearch.com](mailto:rebecca.ganley@scionresearch.com)

Alain Roques, INRA – UR0633, Zoologie Forestière, 2163 Av. Pomme de pin, CS 40001, 45075 Orléans, France, e-mail: [alain.roques@orleans.inra.fr](mailto:alain.roques@orleans.inra.fr)

Andrew J. Storer, School of Forest Resources and Environmental Science, Michigan Technological University, 1400 Townsend Drive, Houghton, MI 49931, USA, e-mail: [storer@mtu.edu](mailto:storer@mtu.edu)

Correspondence:

Eckehard G. Brockerhoff, Scion (New Zealand Forest Research Institute), Christchurch, New Zealand, e-mail: [eckehard.brockerhoff@scionresearch.com](mailto:eckehard.brockerhoff@scionresearch.com), Tel +64 364 2949, Fax +64 364 2812

## 1 **Abstract**

2 Pitch canker, caused by the pathogen *Fusarium circinatum*, is a serious disease of pines, *Pinus*  
3 species. It is a threat to natural and planted pine forests, and to date it has invaded countries  
4 across five continents. Pine-feeding insects can play a key role in the epidemiology of the  
5 disease, as wounding agents allowing pathogen access or as vectors transmitting the pathogen  
6 from infected to healthy trees. We reviewed the role of insects in the epidemiology of pitch  
7 canker worldwide and assessed which insects are present in New Zealand that may act as  
8 wounding agents or vectors to determine whether pathogen invasion could adversely affect *Pinus*  
9 *radiata* plantation forests and urban trees. We also evaluated whether cone or seed insects of  
10 pines could be introduced as biological control agents of invasive *Pinus contorta* and how this  
11 may affect the impact of a potential *F. circinatum* invasion. As there are no native pines or other  
12 Pinaceae in New Zealand, there are only few pine insects, mainly accidental introductions. None  
13 of the insects recorded on pines in New Zealand is likely to be a vector, suggesting low disease  
14 risk. Of six potentially suitable biocontrol candidates, the European pine cone weevil *Pissodes*  
15 *validirostris* is the most promising regarding host specificity and impact on seed production, but  
16 there is uncertainty about its ability to act as vector of *F. circinatum*. Our methodology to review  
17 and evaluate the vector potential of pine associates can be used as a generic framework to assess  
18 the potential impacts of *F. circinatum* invasion.

19  
20 **Keywords:** Cone and seed insects; invasive alien species; pathogen vectors; pitch canker

21  
22  
23

24 **Introduction**

25

26 Pitch canker, caused by the pathogen *Fusarium circinatum* (Nirenberg and O'Donnell), is a  
27 serious disease of some pines (*Pinus* spp.) (Dick 1998; Gordon et al. 2001; Wingfield et al.  
28 2008). Since the 1980's it has emerged as a particularly damaging disease of *Pinus radiata* D.  
29 Don in the native range of this pine in various parts of California (Storer et al. 1997; Gordon et  
30 al. 2001). The pathogen is assumed to originate from Mexico/Central America (Wingfield et al.  
31 2008) from where it has invaded the United States, Haiti, Japan, South Africa, Chile, Spain,  
32 Brazil and Italy, affecting a range of pine species (Dwinell 1999; Wingfield et al. 2002; Carlucci  
33 et al. 2007; Wingfield et al. 2008; Pfenning et al. 2014). The extent of disease problems varies  
34 among regions and host species, and symptoms can be common in forests and plantations (as in  
35 Spain, for example), restricted to nurseries (as reported from Chile), or parks and gardens (as in  
36 Italy). In South Africa, where pitch canker was first detected in 1990 (Viljoen et al. 1994), the  
37 disease remained confined to nurseries until 2005 when an outbreak was reported in young  
38 plantations in the Western Cape Province (Coutinho et al. 2007). Several countries where the  
39 disease has not yet been recorded, including New Zealand, China, and Australia, are thought to  
40 have a climate that is suitable for establishment of the fungus and development of pitch canker  
41 disease (Ganley et al. 2009).

42

43 Studies in California have shown that bark-feeding insects as well as cone and seed insects play  
44 an important role in the infection process, as wounding agents of trees that may allow pathogen  
45 access or as vectors of the pathogen from infected to healthy trees (Fox et al. 1991; Hoover et al.  
46 1996; Storer et al. 1998; Storer et al. 2004a). In New Zealand and other countries in the southern  
47 hemisphere where *Pinus radiata* is widely planted as an exotic tree, there are relatively few  
48 associated insects, mainly because no native Pinaceae are present, and consequently there are no

49 native specialised insect herbivores. Occasionally, some native insects attack pines, although  
50 their direct impact is mostly benign. However, several insect pests of pines have become  
51 introduced over the years. Preliminary reviews of the role of insects associated with pines in New  
52 Zealand as potential vectors of *F. circinatum* have been provided by Gadgil et al. (2003) and  
53 Storer et al. (2004b). Currently, there appear to be few insects in New Zealand that are likely to  
54 act as vectors of the fungus, and this may limit the spread of the fungus and its impact on pine  
55 plantations, if it ever became established there. However, a formal analysis of the potential  
56 vectors of *F. circinatum* in New Zealand is not available.

57  
58 Knowledge about any potential disease vectors and other insect associates is necessary to enable  
59 an informed response in the event of an incursion of *F. circinatum* and to evaluate the risk of  
60 spread (Gadgil et al. 2003; Ganley 2007; Fourrier et al. 2015). The vector issue is also important  
61 for an assessment of the risk of the potential intentional introduction of seed-feeding insects for  
62 biological control of wilding (invasive) *Pinus contorta* Loudon. Several pine species are now  
63 considered environmental weeds in New Zealand and other southern hemisphere countries  
64 (Richardson and Higgins 1998; Rundel et al. 2014). In some regions of New Zealand, pines have  
65 invaded natural or semi-natural grassland and scrub communities (Ledgard 1998). Although  
66 plantings of *Pinus contorta* were of limited extent, this species is now considered the most  
67 serious invader among the pines (Ledgard 1998). Options for biological control have been  
68 assessed (Brockerhoff and Kay 1998; Brockerhoff et al. 2004). Because several pine species are  
69 highly valued in plantation forestry and also in urban amenity plantings, the potential use of cone  
70 and seed insects is a favoured approach as such insects may reduce the spread of pines without  
71 affecting growth or causing damage to other parts of trees. In addition, most cone and seed  
72 insects are specialised, adapted species that exhibit a high degree of host plant specificity  
73 (Turgeon et al. 1994), therefore limiting risks to non-target plants. On the other hand, seed-eating

74 insects may not be as effective as other types of biocontrol agents, and it remains to be  
75 determined whether their effect actually reduces plant spread rates (e.g., Rees and Paynter 1997).  
76 Based on a review of cone and seed insects that attack *Pinus contorta*, considering host  
77 specificity, potential impact on seed production and other criteria, some insects are thought to  
78 show promise as potential biocontrol agents, both in New Zealand and South Africa (Brockhoff  
79 and Kay 1998; Brockhoff et al. 2004; Roques et al. 2004). However, it is feared that the  
80 introduction of such insects to New Zealand would greatly increase the risks associated with *F.*  
81 *circinatum* because the biocontrol agent may act as an additional, and potentially important,  
82 vector of the pitch canker pathogen. In South Africa, such concerns have halted plans to  
83 introduce a cone insect for biocontrol of invasive pines (Lennox et al. 2009), although there is  
84 renewed interest in the approach.

85  
86 Here we review the role of insects in the epidemiology of pitch canker world-wide and assess  
87 which insects present in New Zealand may act as vectors. We also review the preliminary  
88 selection of biocontrol agents against invasive pines and explore the risks of introducing such  
89 biocontrol agents to New Zealand, particularly with regard to our current knowledge about  
90 implications for vectoring *F. circinatum*. Our specific objectives are:

- 91 i. to provide an overview of the insects associated with pitch canker and their role in  
92 disease epidemiology in the countries where the disease occurs to date;
- 93 ii. to review the native and introduced insects found on pines in New Zealand, to determine  
94 the likelihood of these species acting as vectors of *F. circinatum*;
- 95 iii. to evaluate the insects potentially suitable for biocontrol of *Pinus contorta* in New  
96 Zealand and to assess the risk of their introduction in relation to the potential  
97 establishment of *F. circinatum*; and

98 iv. to develop a general framework for the assessment of risks associated with vectors of *F.*  
99 *circinatum* or similar pathogens that can also be used for other countries.

100

101

102 **Wounding agents, vectors and carriers of *Fusarium circinatum* and their interactions with**  
103 **the pathogen**

104

105 In some regions insects have been shown to play an important role in the infection process while  
106 in other regions insects appear to play a minor role. Associations with insects have been best  
107 studied in California where pitch canker has become a major disease of the native *Pinus radiata*,  
108 which is among the most susceptible species of pine (Correll et al. 1991; Adams et al. 1999;  
109 Storer et al. 2002). Insects can act as ‘wounding agents’ that allow the pathogen to enter the plant  
110 via the damaged cuticle or via tunnels such as those made by bark beetles. Some insects are  
111 ‘carriers’ because they carry inoculum from diseased plants they either visited or on which they  
112 have developed. However, in order to be classified as a ‘vector’, Leach’s postulates need to be  
113 met (Leach 1940). These state that in addition to being associated with diseased plants, carrying  
114 the pathogen, and visiting susceptible plant hosts, an organism must be capable of successfully  
115 transmitting the pathogen to plants that were not yet infected under controlled conditions. Some  
116 wounding agents act concurrently as vectors but a vector can also cause an infection via a wound  
117 caused by another species. Not all carriers of inoculum are necessarily successful vectors, for  
118 example, if they are not causing any wounding that would be sufficient for transmission. It is  
119 therefore important to consider the differences in involvement of the various insects associated  
120 with diseased or healthy host plants and to classify each species accordingly (Table 1).

121

122 Insects that feed subcortically on live trees or that wound live trees during exploratory host  
123 feeding have been shown to vector the pitch canker pathogen in California, especially bark  
124 beetles such as *Ips paraconfusus* (Fox et al. 1991) and twig beetles, *Pityophthorus* spp. (Storer et  
125 al. 2004a; Erbilgin et al 2008; Table 1; see Supplementary Table S1 for an alphabetical listing of  
126 insect species). Twig beetles are thought to vector the pitch canker pathogen into pines also  
127 during exploratory feeding to find suitable host material. Baiting trees with pheromones of  
128 *Pityophthorus setosus* resulted in pitch canker infections on those trees despite the lack of  
129 colonization by the insect (Storer et al 2004a). Other habits that may result in wounding include  
130 shoot feeding and the creation of wounds during oviposition. The cone beetles, *Conophthorus*  
131 *radiatae* and *Ernobius punctulatus* are also confirmed vectors (Hoover et al. 1995, 1996; Table  
132 1). Several other species, including shoot and foliage feeders, sap suckers and predatory insects  
133 are known wounding agents or carriers but none of these are known vectors (Table 1,  
134 Supplementary Table S1).

136 To assess the role of insects in the infection of trees by *F. circinatum* and the epidemiology of the  
137 disease, it is important to consider the life cycles of both the pathogen and potential vectors and  
138 the nature of potential interactions between these organisms. Fruit bodies of *F. circinatum*  
139 (known as sporodochia) containing thousands of asexual spores (conidia) may be produced on  
140 the surface of infected tissues when conditions are moist. These are dispersed by water-splash  
141 and can be carried in air currents throughout the year (Blakeslee et al. 1978; Correll et al. 1991).  
142 Spores can also be recovered from the surface bark of trees even when fruit bodies are not readily  
143 apparent (Adams et al. 1999). Two rounds of studies have been conducted where spore  
144 suspensions were sprayed on small trees in the field and the branches were then baited with twig  
145 beetle pheromones (Sakamoto et al. 2007). The results showed no difference in disease between  
146 treated and untreated trees. It is likely that spore loads were very high in these studies compared



147 with what occurs naturally. It seems likely that the insects pick up spores in the tree, perhaps  
148 while chewing their way out through diseased tissue. Insects coming into contact with the  
149 sporodochia may readily pick up many of the sticky spores that are likely to adhere to the surface  
150 of the body and be trapped amongst hairs and other surface structures (e.g., Yamoah et al. 2011).  
151 Fox et al. (1990) reported the isolation of the pathogen from galleries of *Ips* spp. in *Pinus radiata*  
152 trees. The beetles carry propagules that presumably can include hyphal fragments as well as  
153 spores. By contrast, it is likely that the importance of casually acquiring spores from the tree  
154 surface is low. The risk of transmission appears to vary at different times of the year according to  
155 propagule loads on two *Ips* species (Erbilgin et al. 2008). Spore loads of twig beetles were  
156 considered an important factor in studies of the vector efficiency (Erbilgin et al. 2009).

157  
158 Once infection has occurred the fungus colonises the sapwood and can be readily isolated from  
159 discoloured or resinous tissues (McCain et al. 1987; Correll et al. 1991). However, the fungus  
160 does not spread great distances within the wood. Infection of a cone, or a cone whorl, vectored by  
161 cone insects or other borers leads to death of the branch beyond the cone, with each dead branch  
162 being the result of a separate infection. Although unsightly, the branch and twig death that would  
163 result from infections transmitted by cone and seed insects would probably have relatively little  
164 impact on tree growth. Lesions on branches girdle the branch so the distal portion dies; spread  
165 down the branch or shoot is usually arrested at the node (Dwinell et al 1985; Gordon et al. 2001).  
166 Individual trees may thus sustain crown infections for many years. However, crown dieback can  
167 be extensive due to the multiple infections. Trunk infections are often initiated by bark beetles,  
168 and tree death will follow girdling of the stem from a number of separate infections and/or  
169 attacks by bark beetles. Multiple trunk attacks are required in order to kill the cambium around  
170 the circumference and for tree death to result (Gordon et al. 2001; Storer et al. 2002). Bark

171 beetles (especially *Ips* spp. and *Dendroctonus* spp.) can cause considerable mortality of pines  
172 also in the absence of any other disease agents (e.g., Six and Wingfield 2011).

173

174 In the absence of insects vectoring *F. circinatum* to the trunk of the trees, any stem infections  
175 would be initiated through infection of wounds created by other causes including weather events  
176 (such as wind and hail), pruning or cone collection (Dwinell et al. 1985; Gordon et al. 2001). In  
177 New Zealand, wounds could also occur from bark stripping by native parrots (Dick 1998),  
178 although this is rare.

179

180 Spread of the pitch canker disease in nurseries is different from what occurs in forests. The  
181 fungus has been reported to be capable of spreading through nurseries very rapidly, with  
182 devastating losses recorded (Viljoen et al. 1994). Unlike in older trees, wounds are not required  
183 for infection of young seedlings. Insect-vectored transmission is apparently not important (Hurley  
184 et al. 2007). Unfortunately, in contrast to the majority of pine nursery diseases where diligent  
185 application of fungicides will generally reduce the impacts of pathogens, chemical control of  
186 pitch canker disease has been found to be relatively ineffective (M.J. Wingfield pers. com.).  
187 However, rigorous sanitation procedures can reduce disease incidence to insignificant levels in a  
188 nursery where all plants are containerised (Van Wyk et al. 2012). Based on this knowledge, we  
189 can predict with reasonable confidence the outcome of an introduction of *F. circinatum* to a  
190 nursery in New Zealand where plants are reared both as bare root in nursery beds and in  
191 containers (Gadgil et al. 2003). Eradication attempts are likely to result in nursery closure while  
192 soil fumigation is undertaken followed by a high level of sanitation. Although insects are not  
193 thought to be important in the disease epidemiology within nurseries, certain insects may be  
194 involved in spreading the disease from nurseries to surrounding forests. It is more likely that

195 transmission of the fungus to a plantation would occur via out planting of asymptomatic infected  
196 seedlings from a nursery than by insects.

197

198

### 199 **Potential vectors present in New Zealand**

200

201 Where pines occur naturally there is a substantial fauna of associated insects. For example, in  
202 North America (north of Mexico) over 1100 insect species have been recorded as feeding on  
203 pines, including about 30 introduced insect species (de Groot and Turgeon 1998). The majority  
204 of these species were classed as either monophagous (ca. 50%) or oligophagous (ca. 30%) (i.e.,  
205 more or less specific to pines).

206

207 The New Zealand flora includes no native pines or any other native Pinaceae, and as a result  
208 there are no native insects that are closely associated with pines. However, several native insects,  
209 primarily polyphagous species, have colonised pines growing in New Zealand, usually occurring  
210 at low densities (e.g., Berndt et al. 2004). The most common insects found on pines in New  
211 Zealand are introduced species from the native range of pines, mainly from Europe and North  
212 America, such as a number of bark beetles and longhorned beetles (Brockerhoff et al. 2006).

213

214 To obtain an indication of the relative abundance of insects associated with pines in New  
215 Zealand we queried the *Forest Health Database* (maintained by Scion/New Zealand Forest  
216 Research Institute) (Bulman 1990). The database of forest health surveillance reports contains  
217 over 3000 records of formally identified insects. This provided a list of over 500 insect species  
218 although most of these represent incidental observations of species that do not feed on pines.  
219 Nevertheless, the results of this database query do reflect which pine-feeding insects are most

220 commonly found on pines growing in New Zealand's plantation forests and as amenity trees.  
221 These common associates are most likely to play a role in the epidemiology of the pitch canker  
222 disease, should it become established in New Zealand. By contrast, insects that are only rarely  
223 found on pines are probably irrelevant, especially if they have no feeding or other close  
224 relationship. The 25 most commonly recorded insect species on pines in New Zealand (Table 2)  
225 represent all the feeding guilds of insects that have been considered overseas with regard to their  
226 association with pitch canker, except for pine cone insects (of which there are none in New  
227 Zealand), and predators or parasitoids (of which several were recorded but at low frequencies).  
228 These common associates were categorised with regard to the host status during attack (i.e., live  
229 or dead trees) using information from Scion's *Forest Health Database* and from the *Forest and*  
230 *Timber Insects* series (e.g., Brockerhoff and Hosking 2001). All species were then assessed for  
231 their potential to act as a wounding agent, carrier of *F. circinatum* inoculum, or vector (Table 2).  
232  
233 Currently there are no high-risk species in New Zealand that could act as vector of the pitch  
234 canker pathogen. Of the insect species that have been demonstrated to vector *F. circinatum*  
235 elsewhere, none are currently known to exist in New Zealand. *Ernobius mollis*, an alien anobiid,  
236 is the only species that occurs in New Zealand that has a congeneric species known to vector the  
237 pathogen in the United States. *Ernobius mollis* colonises and breeds mostly in dead trees and it is  
238 therefore unlikely to be able to vector the pathogen to live trees although it has occasionally been  
239 observed in Europe to colonize cones of *Pinus brutia*, *Pseudotsuga menziesii* and  
240 *Sequoiadendron gigantea* attacked by cone pyralids (Roques, 1983). Of the insects that have  
241 been recorded from *Pinus radiata* in New Zealand, it is those that feed subcortically on live trees  
242 or that wound live trees during exploratory host feeding (such as *Ips paraconfusus* and  
243 *Pityophthorus setosus* in California) that would represent the greatest concern regarding  
244 association with the pitch canker pathogen. No such species that is a confirmed vector is present

245 in New Zealand (Table 2). Of the other species, *Hylastes ater* is a representative of a genus that  
246 is known to carry the pathogen in the United States (Storer et al 2004b). In Spain, *F. circinatum*  
247 has not been isolated from *H. ater*, however, another species in the same genus, *Hylastes*  
248 *attenuatus*, can be a carrier of the pathogen (Romón et al. 2007, 2008). Nevertheless, *Hylastes*  
249 *ater* is known to attack seedlings (for maturation feeding) and this could raise its risk status but  
250 based on current information, it is not thought to be a potential vector. *Sirex noctilio* is known to  
251 attack live pine trees but for several decades the species has been generally uncommon in New  
252 Zealand (Bain et al. 2011). Furthermore, it is not known to be a carrier of *F. circinatum* in any  
253 country where pitch canker occurs. Therefore, it is unlikely to become an important vector if *F.*  
254 *circinatum* became established in New Zealand.

255  
256 Gadgil et al. (2003) list 14 sap-feeding species as potential vectors of the pitch canker pathogen  
257 in New Zealand, although most of these are not associated with pines. Among sap feeding  
258 species in California, only spittlebugs have been shown to be associated with pitch canker (Storer  
259 et al. 1998), even though other sap feeding species such as the Monterey pine scale, *Physokermes*  
260 *insignicola* (Homoptera: Coccidae), commonly occur in native and planted *Pinus radiata* forests  
261 in California. The absence of a spittlebug feeding on *Pinus radiata* in New Zealand and the  
262 apparent lack of association of the pathogen with other sap feeders suggests that these species  
263 should not be considered to be significant associates of *F. circinatum* in New Zealand.

264

265

## 266 **Potential biological control agents for invasive pines**

267

268 A preliminary evaluation of potential biological control agents against wilding pines in New  
269 Zealand was conducted by Brockerhoff and Kay (1998). The main target species was *Pinus*

270 *contorta* because it is considered the most important invader. Also, this pine has not been planted  
271 in commercial plantations for several decades, and biocontrol using seed-feeding insects is  
272 therefore less controversial than against a target species that is economically important  
273 (Brockerhoff and Kay 1998). A number of criteria were applied in the selection of potential  
274 agents including: the candidate agent should have a host range that includes the target species  
275 and subspecies, be sufficiently host specific such that it would not attack non-target tree species,  
276 be compatible with the climate in the target region(s) in New Zealand, reduce seed production of  
277 the target species substantially, and be able to disperse to isolated tree populations. In addition,  
278 the agent should not have any other unwanted effects such as a potential contribution to tree  
279 disease dynamics (see below). The survey focussed on cone insects within the natural range of  
280 *Pinus contorta* and also on cone insects that have colonised the species in areas where the tree  
281 was introduced, especially in parts of Europe. Based on this, 16 species were assessed  
282 (Brockerhoff and Kay 1998) of which six species were considered to be potentially suitable and  
283 worthy of further consideration and research (Table 3). The other species were insufficiently host  
284 specific or attacked other parts of trees, which could affect tree growth.

285  
286 The North American cone moth *Eucosma rescissoriana* can significantly reduce seed production,  
287 but this species was disregarded on the basis of its wider host range that covers firs (*Abies*  
288 *grandis*, *A. lasiocarpa*) and pines (*Pinus contorta*, *Pinus monticola* and possibly *Pinus*  
289 *albicaulis*; Hedlin et al., 1980). However, the host range of this species should be reviewed as all  
290 other species of *Eucosma* are genus-specific, and it is unusual that *Eucosma rescissoriana* attacks  
291 both firs and pines. Three other species, the anobiid *Ernobius nigrans*, the cerambycid *Paratimia*  
292 *conicola*, and the tortricid *Cydia toreuta*, may be sufficiently host specific but they usually have a  
293 more limited effect on seed production, at least in their natural geographic range. Most promising  
294 were the pine cone beetle *Conophthorus ponderosae*, a North American species, and *Pissodes*

295 *validirostris*, the European pine cone weevil. Both these species have a narrow host range and  
296 the ability to reduce seed production considerably (Brockerhoff and Kay 1998; Brockerhoff et al.  
297 2004). However, *Pissodes validirostris* appeared to be the most effective in terms of its effects  
298 on seed production, possibly because the two species did not co-evolve, and *Pinus contorta* may  
299 not have developed adaptations against this particular cone insect. Based on these findings, we  
300 prioritised *Pissodes validirostris* as the agent of first choice for more detailed consideration and  
301 for potential introduction to New Zealand.

302  
303 Out of a total of 21 insect species known to develop in the cones of *Pinus* spp. in Europe and in  
304 the Mediterranean basin, *Pissodes validirostris* is the most damaging cone insect (Roques 1983;  
305 Roques & El Alaoui El Fels 2002). Most other species cause only minor damage. *Pissodes*  
306 *validirostris* is present all over the Palaearctic region from Portugal and Scandinavia to northern  
307 China (Roques 1983). Larvae of *Pissodes validirostris* develop exclusively in pine cones,  
308 tunneling through the tissues and destroying the seeds. They attack native pines of the subgenus  
309 *Pinus* such as *Pinus sylvestris*, *P. mugo*, *P. uncinata*, *P. nigra* and subspecies, and *P.*  
310 *leucodermis* which all belong to the subsection *Pinus* (Gernandt et al. 2005), as well as  
311 Mediterranean pines of the subsection *Pinaster*, such as *P. pinaster*, *P. halepensis*, and *P. pinea*)  
312 (Roques, 1983). Weevil attacks are also recorded on some North American pines widely planted  
313 in Europe such as lodgepole pine, *Pinus contorta* (Annala 1975; Delplanque et al. 1988), a  
314 species of the subgenus *Pinus* but from the section *Trifoliae*. Cone damage from *P. validirostris*  
315 was recently noticed in French arboreta on *Pinus hartwegii* (= *P. rudis*), a member of the  
316 subsection *Ponderosae* (Alain Roques, unpublished data). By contrast, the North American  
317 pines *Pinus radiata* and *P. taeda*, belonging to the subsection *Australes* of the subgenus *Pinus*,  
318 are not known to be attacked or damaged, despite the presence of large areas of planted forest of  
319 these species in parts of south-western Europe where *Pissodes validirostris* is generally very

320 common on its normal hosts (Roques et al. 2004). In addition, native pine species in the  
321 subgenus *Strobos* such as Swiss stone pine (*Pinus cembra*), are avoided (Dormont and Roques  
322 1999) as are exotic pines of the same subgenus, probably due to specific host volatiles (Dormont  
323 and Roques 2001). However, host-specificity tests revealed that there are different biotypes of *P.*  
324 *validirostris* which specialize on pines either of the subsection *Pinus* or of the subsection  
325 *Pinaster* (Roques et al. 2004). Recent molecular and morphometric studies confirmed that the  
326 species *Pissodes validirostris* probably incorporates discrete taxa, or at least independent  
327 evolutionary lineages. At least three phylogeographic lineages were identified corresponding to  
328 the populations of the Iberian Peninsula, Central Europe and Northern/ Eastern Europe,  
329 respectively, which correspond to the differences in host plant preferences (Géraldine Roux, pers.  
330 comm.). Populations that colonized *Pinus contorta* are more closely associated with Central and  
331 Northern European populations on *Pinus sylvestris* than with those developing on Mediterranean  
332 pines (Roques et al. 2004; Géraldine Roux, pers. comm.). This suggests that *Pinus sylvestris* was  
333 the original host for these populations. In no-choice host selection experiments, both biotypes of  
334 *Pissodes* were capable of laying eggs on cones of *Pinus radiata*, but only the larvae originating  
335 from populations of the *Pinus sylvestris* biotype were capable of completing their development in  
336 these cones (Roques et al. 2004).

337  
338 Cone damage by *Pissodes validirostris* greater than 80% has been reported from natural stands of  
339 *Pinus pinea* in Spain (Bachiller 1966) and of *Pinus sylvestris* and *Pinus uncinata* in France  
340 (Roques 1977; Roques et al. 1983). However, *Pinus contorta* appears to be significantly more  
341 attacked than *Pinus sylvestris* when these two species are planted in proximity. In Finland, 42% -  
342 94% of *Pinus contorta* cones were damaged by *Pissodes validirostris* compared with 1% - 55%  
343 of *Pinus sylvestris* (Annala and Hiltunen 1977). In central France, cone damage in *Pinus contorta*  
344 was nearly twice the damage in *P. sylvestris* (82.0% vs. 46.3%) (Delplanque et al. 1988). Larvae



345 of *Pissodes validirostris* affect seed yield by direct feeding and by inducing resin bleeding  
346 (Roques 1976). Resin bleeding reduces seed dispersal by preventing the cone scales from  
347 opening (Roques 1976). In *Pinus sylvestris*, 3-4 larvae of *P. validirostris* are enough to destroy a  
348 cone completely (Roques 1976), but in pine species with larger cones (e.g., *Pinus pinaster*) the  
349 number of larvae must be greater than four to get the same result. In the small-sized cones of  
350 *Pinus contorta*, each weevil larva is responsible for a loss of 40 to 60% of the seed content  
351 (Delplanque et al. 1988) whilst the presence of 2 larvae per cone increases seed loss to ca. 80%  
352 (Annala 1975).

353

354

### 355 **Risks associated with introducing biocontrol agents against invasive pines**

356

357 Based on the available information about potential effectiveness and non-target impacts, the most  
358 promising potential biocontrol agents against wilding pines in New Zealand are the ponderosa  
359 pine cone beetle, *Conophthorus ponderosae*, and the pine cone weevil, *Pissodes validirostris*  
360 (Brockerhoff and Kay 1998, above). In addition, the lodgepole pine cone moth, *Eucosma*  
361 *rescissoriana*, could be considered if it can be determined that it is sufficiently host specific.

362 There are important issues that need to be addressed concerning the risk of these insects  
363 becoming vectors of the pitch canker pathogen and thereby causing unwanted damage of pines in  
364 planted forests. Biocontrol agents that enter the host tissues (as opposed to feeding externally)  
365 have a high potential to act as vectors of the pitch canker pathogen. In addition, those that cause  
366 wounds to branches and stems may also act as vectors as has been shown for twig beetles in the  
367 Western United States (e.g. Storer et al. 2004a).

368

369 *Conophthorus ponderosae* has a congeneric species that is a confirmed vector of the pathogen in  
370 California and therefore it may be a vector in New Zealand. Although *Pinus radiata* is not a  
371 known host species (Storer et al. 2004b), a host switch could occur.

372  
373 The lodgepole pine cone moth, *Eucosma rescissoriana*, may become associated with the pitch  
374 canker pathogen as a vector or as a wounding agent. A shift in habit by this species to include the  
375 shoot feeding habit exhibited by other members of the genus could also increase the significance  
376 of any association with the pathogen.

377  
378 Although larval and pupal development of *Pissodes validirostris* occurs entirely in seed cones,  
379 adult weevils require maturation feeding, typically on the pine leader shoots, in spring in order to  
380 become sexually mature and capable of laying eggs on cones (Roques 1976). Another period of  
381 feeding on leader shoots is observed in autumn before the adults settle to overwinter in the bark  
382 of the trees (Roques et al. 2004). In contrast to egg-laying, behavioral tests showed that the  
383 different biotypes of *Pissodes validirostris* can feed on the shoots of a large number of pine  
384 species. Such damage did not appear to affect plant health (Roques et al. 2004), but it may help  
385 fungal transmission. Fresh adults washed immediately after emergence from the cones did not  
386 carry any *F. circinatum* conidia (Lennox et al. 2009). In an experiment, feeding on *Pinus radiata*  
387 seedlings by adult *P. validirostris* that had been artificially infected with *F. circinatum* did not  
388 show any transmission of conidia. However, its feeding damage appeared to facilitate the ingress  
389 of the fungus into the host plant (Lennox et al. 2009).

390  
391 Based on these findings, it cannot be ruled out that *Pissodes validirostris*, if it were introduced to  
392 New Zealand, could act as a vector of *F. circinatum* should the pathogen become established  
393 there. The behavior of this species would allow several types of association with the pitch canker

394 pathogen including spreading the pathogen by dissemination through adults emerging with the  
395 pathogen, inoculation of the pathogen during egg laying and adult feeding, ingress through  
396 egg laying, adult and larval feeding, and invasion during larval feeding. The most likely  
397 responsible mechanism is the maturation feeding behaviour of this weevil. Furthermore, *Pissodes*  
398 *validirostris* has a demonstrated ability to colonise new hosts, such as *Pinus contorta*, and this  
399 represents a new insect-host plant association. The potential for additional changes in host use in  
400 new environments cannot be ruled out. If *Pissodes validirostris* were to colonise and damage  
401 cones of *Pinus radiata*, then it could also affect breeding programmes and the production of seed  
402 for nurseries.

403

404

## 405 **Conclusions**

406

407 The pitch canker disease caused by the pathogen *F. circinatum* represents a major threat to pine  
408 forests worldwide. *Pinus radiata* is one of the most susceptible pines, and it is an important tree  
409 in planted forests in New Zealand and several other countries where *F. circinatum* does not yet  
410 occur. In New Zealand, this risk is moderated by the fact that no known vectors of *F. circinatum*  
411 are present. Our review identified several species that could play a role in the epidemiology of  
412 the disease in New Zealand, as wounding agents or carriers of the pathogen, but no insects appear  
413 to be present that could act as effective vectors. Against this background, the proposed  
414 introduction of biocontrol agents against invasive *Pinus contorta* or other pines has been deemed  
415 too risky, mainly because of the pitch canker pathogen vectoring issue (Dick and Bain 2004).  
416 Furthermore, it is not certain how effective a biocontrol agent would be in terms of reducing the  
417 spread of wilding pines. While the success of past biocontrol introductions has been high, with  
418 83% providing partial or complete control of target plants, seed eating agents have perhaps been

419 less effective (Fowler et al. 2000; Suckling 2013). A similar proposal to introduce seed eating  
420 insects for the control of invasive pines has been considered in South Africa (Hoffmann et al.  
421 2011). Recently it has been decided not to pursue this further due to risks associated with pitch  
422 canker in South Africa where the disease is already present, and because of questions about the  
423 effectiveness of biocontrol relying solely on cone and seed insects (Lennox et al. 2009). Further  
424 research on insects present in New Zealand and on potential biocontrol agents could be  
425 conducted in regions where these species occur and where *F. circinatum* is also present (e.g.,  
426 Spain and South Africa for some of the European insects). This would assist with further risk  
427 assessments and possible future incursion responses.

428

429

#### 430 **Acknowledgements**

431 We thank John Bain for reviewing an earlier version of the manuscript. Funding for this review  
432 was obtained from the New Zealand Government (FRST contract C04X0302 and Better Border  
433 Biosecurity via MBIE core funding to Scion, contract C04X1104).

434

435

#### 436 **References**

- 437 Adams DH, Frankel SJ, Tidwell TE (1999) Chronicle of pitch canker in California. In: Devey  
438 ME, Matheson AC, Gordon TR (eds.) Current and potential impacts of pitch canker in  
439 radiata pine, Proceedings of the IMPACT Monterey workshop, California, USA, 30  
440 Nov. to 3 Dec. 1998, CSIRO Forestry and Forest Products Report No. 112, CSIRO,  
441 Canberra, pp. 49–53.
- 442 Annala E (1975) The biology of *Pissodes validirostris* Gyll. (Col. Curculionidae) and its  
443 harmfulness, especially in Scots pine seed orchards. Commun Inst For Fenn 85:1–95.

- 444 Annila E, Hiltunen R (1977) Damage by *Pissodes validirostris* (Coleoptera, Curculionidae)  
445 studied in relation to the monoterpene composition in Scots pine and Lodgepole pine. Ann  
446 Entomol Fenn 43:87–92.
- 447 Bachiller P (1966) Estudio sobre la biología y tratamientos del *Pissodes validirostris* Gyll. Boll  
448 Serv Plagas For 9:133–136.
- 449 Bain J, Sopow SL, Bulman LS (2011) The sirex woodwasp in New Zealand: history and current  
450 status. In: Slippers B, de Groot P, Wingfield MJ (eds) The sirex woodwasp and its fungal  
451 symbiont. Research and management of a worldwide invasive pest. Springer, Dordrecht,  
452 pp. 167–173.
- 453 Berndt LA, Brockerhoff EG, Jactel H, Weis T, Beaton J (2004) Biology and rearing of  
454 *Pseudocoremia suavis*, an endemic looper (Lepidoptera: Geometridae) with a history of  
455 outbreaks on exotic conifers. New Zeal Entomol 27:73–82.
- 456 Blakeslee GM, Oak SW, Gregory W, Moses CS (1978) Natural association of *Fusarium*  
457 *moniliforme* var. *subglutinans* with *Pissodes nemorensis*. Phytopathol News 12:208.
- 458 Blakeslee GM, Foltz JL (1981) The deodar weevil, a vector and wounding agent associated with  
459 pitch canker of slash pine. Phytopathology 71:861.
- 460 Brockerhoff EG, Kay M (1998) Prospects and risks of biological control of wilding *Pinus*  
461 *contorta* in New Zealand. Proceedings, 51st New Zealand Plant Protection Conference,  
462 New Zealand Plant Protection Society, pp. 216–223.
- 463 Brockerhoff EG, Hosking GP (2001) *Arhopalus tristis* (F.) (Coleoptera: Cerambycidae), burnt  
464 pine longhorn beetle. Forest and Timber Insects in New Zealand 27 (revised), Forest  
465 Research Institute (Scion), Rotorua, New Zealand, pp. 1–7.
- 466 Brockerhoff EG, Hoffmann J, Roques A (2004) Is biological control an option for the  
467 management of wilding pines (*Pinus* spp.) in New Zealand? In: Hill RL, Zydenbos SM,

- 468 Bezar CM (eds.) Managing wilding conifers in New Zealand: Present and Future, New  
469 Zealand Plant Protection Society, Christchurch, pp. 65–78.
- 470 Brockerhoff EG, Jones DC, Kimberley MO, Suckling DM, Donaldson T (2006) Nation-wide  
471 survey for invasive wood boring and bark beetles (Coleoptera) using traps baited with  
472 pheromones and kairomones. *Forest Ecol Manag* 228:234–240.
- 473 Bulman LS (1990) BUGS and HEALTH — integral part of forest protection strategy. What’s  
474 new in Forest Research No. 197. Forest Research Institute, Rotorua, New Zealand.
- 475 Carlucci A, Colatruglio L, Frisullo S (2007) First report of pitch canker caused by *Fusarium*  
476 *circinatum* on *Pinus halepensis* and *P. pinea* in Apulia (Southern Italy). *Plant Dis* 91:1683.
- 477 Correll JC, Gordon TR, McCain AH, Fox JW, Koehler CS, Wood DL, Schultz ME (1991) Pitch  
478 canker in California: pathogenicity, distribution and canker development on Monterey pine  
479 (*Pinus radiata*). *Plant Dis* 75:676–682.
- 480 Coutinho TA, Steenkamp ET, Mongwaketsi K, Wilmot M, Wingfield MJ (2007) First outbreak  
481 of pitch canker in a South African pine plantation. *Australas Plant Path* 36(3):256–261.
- 482 Dallara PL (1997) Studies on the distribution, interspecific relationships, host range, and  
483 chemical ecology of *Pityophthorus* spp. (Coleoptera: Scolytidae) and selected insectan  
484 associates, and their associations with *Fusarium subglutinans* f. sp. *pini* in central coastal  
485 California. Dissertation, University of California, Berkeley.
- 486 de Groot P, Turgeon JJ (1998) Insect-pine interactions. In: Richardson DA (ed.) Ecology and  
487 biogeography of *Pinus*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 354–380.
- 488 Delplanque A, Giovanini JP, Roques A, Augustin S (1988) Primeros problemas entomologicas  
489 consecutivos a la introduccion de *Pinus contorta* Douglas en Francia. *Plagas Forestales*  
490 16:123–132.
- 491 Dick MA (1998) Pine pitch canker - the threat to New Zealand. *New Zeal J For* 42:30–34.

- 492 Dick M, Bain J (2004) Biocontrol of wildings - could it be trouble? New Zeal Tree Grower  
493 25(1):32.
- 494 Dormont L, Roques A (1999). A survey of insects attacking seed cones of *Pinus cembra* in the  
495 Alps, the Pyrenees and Massif Central. J Appl Entomol 123:65–72.
- 496 Dormont L, Roques A (2001) Why are seed cones of Swiss stone pine (*Pinus cembra*) not  
497 attacked by the specialized pine cone weevil, *Pissodes validirostris* ? A case of host  
498 selection vs. host suitability. Entomol Exp Appl 99:157–163.
- 499 Dwinell LD, Barrows-Broaddus J, Kuhlman EG (1985) Pitch canker: a disease complex of  
500 southern pines. Plant Dis 69:270–276.
- 501 Dwinell LD (1999) Global distribution of the pitch canker fungus. In: Devey ME, Matheson AC,  
502 Gordon TR (eds.) Current and potential impacts of pitch canker in radiata pine,  
503 Proceedings of the IMPACT Monterey workshop, California, USA, 30 Nov. to 3 Dec.  
504 1998, CSIRO Forestry and Forest Products Report No. 112, CSIRO, Canberra, pp. 54–57.
- 505 Erbilgin N, Storer AJ, Wood DL, Gordon TR (2005) Colonization of cut branches of five  
506 coniferous hosts of the pitch canker fungus by *Pityophthorus* spp. (Coleoptera: Scolytidae)  
507 in central, coastal California. Canadian Entomologist 137:337–349.
- 508 Erbilgin N, Ritokova G, Gordon TR, Wood DL, Storer AJ (2008) Temporal variation in  
509 contamination of pine engraver beetles with *Fusarium circinatum* in native Monterey pine  
510 forests in California. Plant Path 57:1103–1108.
- 511 Erbilgin N, Gordon TR, Wood DL, Storer AJ (2009) Bark beetle (Coleoptera: Scolytidae)-  
512 mediated fungal infections of susceptible trees induce resistance to subsequent infections in  
513 a dose dependent manner. Agric For Entomol 11: 255–263.
- 514 Fourrier C, Antoine S, Piou D, Ioos R (2015) Rapid detection of *Fusarium circinatum*  
515 propagules on trapped pine beetles. Forest Pathol (in press).

- 516 Fowler SV, Syrett P, Hill RL (2000) Success and safety in the biological control of  
517 environmental weeds in New Zealand. *Austral Ecology* 25:553–562.
- 518 Fox JW, Wood DL, Koehler CS (1990) Distribution and abundance of engraver beetles  
519 (Scolytidae: *Ips* species) on Monterey pines infected with pitch canker. *Can Entomol*  
520 122:1157–1166.
- 521 Fox JW, Wood DL, Koehler CS, O’Keefe ST (1991) Engraver beetles (Scolytidae: *Ips* species)  
522 as vectors of the pitch canker fungus, *Fusarium subglutinans*. *Can Entomol* 123:1355–  
523 1367.
- 524 Gadgil P, Dick M, Simpson J, Bejakovich D, Ross M, Bain J, Wylie R, Horgan G (2003)  
525 Management plan for response to an incursion of pine pitch canker for Australia and for  
526 New Zealand. Unpublished report, Forest Research, Rotorua, New Zealand.
- 527 Ganley R (2007) Pitch canker - risk of establishment in New Zealand based on a global  
528 perspective. *New Zeal J For* 52(2):26–30.
- 529 Ganley RJ, Watt MS, Manning L, Iturritya E (2009) A global climatic risk assessment of pitch  
530 canker disease. *Can J Forest Res* 39:2246–2256.
- 531 Germandt DS, López GG, García SO, Liston A (2005) Phylogeny and classification of *Pinus*.  
532 *Taxon* 54:29–42.
- 533 Gordon TR, Storer AJ, Wood DL (2001) The pitch canker epidemic in California. *Plant Dis*  
534 85:1128–1139.
- 535 Hedlin AF, Yates III HO, Cibrian-Tovar D, Ebel BH, Koerber TW, Merkel EP (1980) Cone and  
536 seed insects of North American conifers. Environment Canada, Canadian Forest Service,  
537 Ottawa; USDA Forest Service, Washington DC; Secr. Agric. Recur. Hidraul., Mexico, pp.  
538 1–122.
- 539 Hoffmann JH, Moran VC, Van Wilgen BW (2011) Prospects for the biological control of  
540 invasive *Pinus* species (Pinaceae) in South Africa. *Afr Entomol* 19(2):393–401.



- 541 Hoover K, Wood DL, Fox JW, Bros WE (1995) Quantitative and seasonal association of the  
542 pitch canker fungus, *Fusarium subglutinans* f. sp. *pini*, with *Conophthorus radiatae*  
543 (Coleoptera: Scolytidae) and *Ernobius punctulatus* (Coleoptera: Anobiidae) which infest  
544 *Pinus radiata*. Can Entomol 127:79–91.
- 545 Hoover K, Wood DL, Storer AJ, Fox JW, Bros WE. 1996. Transmission of the pitch canker  
546 fungus, *Fusarium subglutinans* f. sp. *pini* to Monterey pine, *Pinus radiata*, by cone- and  
547 twig-infesting beetles. Can Entomol 128:981–994.
- 548 Hosking GP. 1978. *Oemona hirta* (Fabricius) (Coleoptera: Cerambycidae), lemon tree borer.  
549 Forest and Timber Insects in New Zealand 31, Forest Research Institute, Rotorua, New  
550 Zealand, pp. 1–4.
- 551 Hurley BP, Slippers B, Coutinho TA, Wingfield BD, Govender P, Wingfield MJ. 2007.  
552 Molecular detection of fungi carried by *Bradysia difformis* (Sciaridae: Diptera) in South  
553 African forestry nurseries. South Hemisph For J 69(2):103–109.
- 554 Iturriza E, Ganley RJ, Wright J, Heppe E, Steenkamp ET, Gordon TR, Wingfield MJ (2011) A  
555 genetically homogenous population of *Fusarium circinatum* causes pitch canker of *Pinus*  
556 *radiata* in the Basque Country, Spain. Fungal Biol 115(3):288–295.
- 557 Keen FP (1958) Cone and seed insects of western forest trees. U.S. Dept. Agric., Tech. Bull.  
558 1169:1–168.
- 559 Leach JB (1940) Insect transmission of plant diseases. McGraw-Hill, New York.
- 560 Ledgard NJ (1998) The spread of lodgepole pine (*Pinus contorta*, Dougl.) in New Zealand.  
561 Forest Ecol Manag 141:43–57.
- 562 Lennox CL, Hoffmann JH, Coutinho TA, Roques A (2009) A threat of exacerbating the spread  
563 of pitch canker precludes further consideration of a cone weevil, *Pissodes validirostris*, for  
564 biological control of invasive pines in South Africa. Biol Control 50:179–184.

- 565 McCain AH, Koehler CS, Tjosvold SA (1987) Pitch canker threatens California pines. Calif  
566 Agric 41:22–23.
- 567 Matthews FR (1962) Pitch canker-tip moth damage association on slash pine seedlings. J Forest  
568 60:825–826.
- 569 Pfenning LH, Costa SDS, Melo MPD, Costa H, Ventura JA, Auer CG, Santos ÁFD (2014). First  
570 report and characterization of *Fusarium circinatum*, the causal agent of pitch canker in  
571 Brazil. Trop Plant Pathol 39(3):210–216.
- 572 Rees M, Paynter Q (1997) Biological control of Scotch broom: modelling the determinants of  
573 abundance and the potential impact of introduced insect herbivores. J Appl Ecol 34:1203–  
574 1221.
- 575 Richardson DM, Higgins SI (1998) Pines as invaders in the southern hemisphere. In: Richardson,  
576 D.A. (ed.), Ecology and biogeography of *Pinus*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge,  
577 pp. 450–473.
- 578 Romón P, Iturrondobeitia JC, Gibson K, Lindgren BS, Goldarazena A (2007) Quantitative  
579 association of bark beetles with pitch canker fungus and effects of verbenone on their  
580 semiochemical communication in Monterey pine forests in northern Spain. Environ  
581 Entomol 36:743–750.
- 582 Romón P, Troya M, de Gamarra ME, Eguzkitza A, Iturrondobeitia J, Goldarazena A (2008)  
583 Fungal communities associated with pitch canker disease of *Pinus radiata* caused by  
584 *Fusarium circinatum* in northern Spain: association with insects and pathogen-saprophyte  
585 antagonistic interactions. [Can J Plant Pathol 30:241–253.](#)
- 586 Roques A (1976) Observations sur la biologie et l'écologie de *Pissodes validirostris* Gyll.  
587 (Coléoptère, Curculionidae) en forêt de Fontainebleau. Ann Zool Ecol Anim 8:533–542.
- 588 Roques A (1977) Etude du complexe entomologique lié aux cônes de pin sylvestre en forêt de  
589 Fontainebleau. B Ecol 8:415–434.

Mis en forme : Français (France)

- 590 | Roques A (1983) Les insectes ravageurs des cônes et graines de conifères en France. INRA,  
591 | Service des Publications, Versailles, France.
- 592 | Roques A, El Alaoui El Fels MA (2002) Overview of the arthropod fauna exploiting seed cones  
593 | in the Mediterranean Basin. In: Lieutier F, Ghaioule D (eds.), Entomological research in  
594 | Mediterranean forest ecosystems, INRA Editions, Versailles, France, pp. 59–78.
- 595 | Roques A, Raimbault JP, Goussard F (1983) L'impact des insectes ravageurs des cônes et graines  
596 | sur la régénération naturelle du Pin à crochets (*Pinus uncinata* Ram.) dans quelques forêts  
597 | de montagne des Alpes du Sud et des Pyrénées Orientales. Acta Biol Montana 2:331–347.
- 598 | Roques A, Roux-Morabito G, Hoffmann JH, Kleinhentz M, Gourov A (2004) Determining the  
599 | suitability of a European cone weevil, *Pissodes validirostris*, for biological control of  
600 | invasive pines in South Africa. In: Cullen JM, Briese DT, Kritikos DJ, Lonsdale WM,  
601 | Morin L, Scott JK (eds.), Proceedings of the XI International Symposium on Biological  
602 | Control of Weeds, 27 April – 2 May 2003, Canberra, Australia. CSIRO Entomology,  
603 | Canberra, pp. 315–321.
- 604 | Rundel PW, Dickie IA, Richardson DM (2014) Tree invasions into treeless areas: Mechanisms  
605 | and ecosystem processes. Biol Invas 16:663–675.
- 606 | Sakamoto JM, Gordon TR, Storer AJ, Wood DL (2007) The role of *Pityophthorus* spp. as  
607 | vectors of pitch canker affecting *Pinus radiata*. Can Entomol 139:864–871.
- 608 | Six DL, Wingfield MJ (2011) The role of phytopathogenicity in bark beetle-fungus symbioses: a  
609 | challenge to the classic paradigm. Annu Rev Entomol 56:255–272.
- 610 | Storer AJ, Gordon TR, Wood DL, Bonello P (1997) Pitch canker disease of pines: current and  
611 | future impacts. J Forest 95:21–26.
- 612 | Storer AJ, Wood DL, Wikler KR, Gordon TR (1998) Association between a native spittlebug  
613 | (Homoptera: Cercopidae) on Monterey pine and an introduced tree pathogen which causes  
614 | pitch canker disease. Can Entomol 130:783–792.

Mis en forme : Français (France)

- 615 Storer AJ, Wood DL, Gordon TR (2002) The epidemiology of pitch canker of Monterey pine in  
616 California. *Forest Sci* 48:694–700.
- 617 Storer AJ, Wood DL, Gordon TR (2004a) Twig beetles, *Pityophthorus* spp. (Coleoptera:  
618 Scolytidae), as vectors of the pitch canker pathogen in California. *Can Entomol* 136:685–  
619 693.
- 620 Storer AJ, Wood DL, Gordon TR (2004b) Could biological control of wilding pines increase the  
621 potential for damage by the pitch canker pathogen? In: Hill RL, Zydenbos SM, Bezar CM  
622 (eds.) *Managing wilding conifers in New Zealand: Present and Future*. New Zealand Plant  
623 Protection Society, Christchurch, pp. 97–111.
- 624 Suckling DM (2013) Benefits from biological control of weeds in New Zealand range from  
625 negligible to massive: A retrospective analysis. *Biol Control* 66:27–32.
- 626 Turgeon JJ, Roques A, de Groot P (1994) Insect fauna of coniferous seed cones: diversity, host  
627 plant interactions, and management. *Annu Rev Entomol* 39:179–212.
- 628 Van Wyk SJP, Boutigny A-L, Coutinho TA, Viljoen A (2012) Sanitation of a South African  
629 forestry nursery contaminated with *Fusarium circinatum* using hydrogen peroxide at  
630 specific oxidation reduction potentials. *Plant Dis* 96:875–880.
- 631 Viljoen A, Wingfield MJ, Marasas WFO (1994) First report of *Fusarium subglutinans* f. sp. *pini*  
632 on seedlings in South Africa. *Plant Dis* 78:309–312.
- 633 Viljoen A, Wingfield MJ, Marasas WFO, Coutinho TA (1997) Pitch canker of pines: a  
634 contemporary review. *S Afr J Sci* 93(9):411–413.
- 635 Wingfield MJ, Jacobs A, Coutinho TA, Ahumada R, Wingfield BD (2002) First report of the  
636 pitch canker fungus, *Fusarium circinatum*, on pines in Chile. *Plant Pathol* 51:397.
- 637 Wingfield MJ, Hammerbacher A, Ganley RJ, Steenkamp ET, Gordon TR, Wingfield BD,  
638 Coutinho TA (2008) Pitch canker caused by *Fusarium circinatum* - a growing threat to  
639 pine plantations and forests worldwide. *Australas Plant Path* 37, 319–334.

640 Yamoah E, Jones EE, Suckling DM, Bourdôt GW, Walter M, Stewart A. 2011. Using insects as  
641 potential vectors of *Fusarium tumidum* to control gorse. *New Zeal Entomol* 34:5–11.

Table 1. Insects associated with *Fusarium circinatum* in regions where pitch canker occurs and the nature of their association. See Supplementary Table S1 for an alphabetical listing of insect species.

Species (* non-indigenous sp.)	Order, family (subfamily)	Wounding agent <sup>a</sup>	Carrier <sup>a</sup>	Confirmed vector <sup>a</sup>	References
<b>USA (SOUTH-EAST)</b>					
<b>Bark beetles and wood borers</b>					
<i>Pissodes nemorensis</i>	Col., Curculionidae, Molytinae	+	+		Blakeslee et al. 1978, Blakeslee and Foltz 1981
<b>Shoot and foliage-feeders</b>					
<i>Rhyacionia</i> spp.	Lepidoptera, Tortricidae	+			Matthews 1962
<i>Contarinia</i> spp.	Diptera, Cecidomyiidae	+			Dwinell et al. 1985
<b>Cone insects</b>					
<i>Cydia</i> spp.	Lepidoptera, Tortricidae	+			Dwinell et al. 1985
<i>Leptoglossus corculus</i>	Heteroptera, Coreidae	+			Dwinell et al. 1985
<b>USA (CALIFORNIA)</b>					
<b>Bark beetles and wood borers</b>					
<i>Ips paraconfusus</i>	Col., Curculionidae, Scolytinae	+	+	+	Fox et al. 1991
<i>Ips mexicanus</i> ,	Col., Curculionidae, Scolytinae	(+)	+	(+)	Fox et al. 1991, Erbilgin et al. 2008
<i>Ips plastographus maritimus</i>	Col., Curculionidae, Scolytinae	(+)	+	(+)	Fox et al. 1991, Erbilgin et al. 2008
<i>Pityophthorus setosus</i>	Col., Curculionidae, Scolytinae	+	+	+	Hoover et al. 1995, Storer et al. 2004a, Erbilgin et al. 2005
<i>Pityophthorus carmeli</i>	Col., Curculionidae, Scolytinae	+	+	(+)	Hoover et al. 1995, Storer et al. 2004a, Erbilgin et al. 2005
<i>Hylastes</i> spp.	Col., Curculionidae, Scolytinae	(+)	+		Storer et al. 2004b
<i>Hylurgops</i> spp.	Col., Curculionidae, Scolytinae	(+)	+		Storer et al. 2004b
<i>Dendroctonus valens</i>	Col., Curculionidae, Scolytinae	(+)	+		Storer et al. 2004b
<i>Pissodes radiatae</i>	Col., Curculionidae, Molytinae?	(+)	+		Storer et al. 2004b
<b>Sapsuckers</b>					
<i>Aphrophora canadensis</i>	Homoptera, Cercopidae	+			Storer et al. 1998
<b>Shoot and foliage-feeders</b>					
(none)					
<b>Cone insects</b>					
<i>Conophthorus radiatae</i>	Col., Curculionidae, Scolytinae	+	+	+	Hoover et al. 1995, 1996
<i>Ernobius punctulatus</i>	Col., Anobiidae		+	+	Hoover et al. 1995, 1996
<b>Predatory insects</b>					
<i>Enoclerus sphegeus</i>	Col., Cleridae		+		Dallara 1997, Storer et al. 2004b
<i>Lasconotus</i> spp.	Col., Colydiidae		+		Dallara 1997, Storer et al. 2004b
<i>Medetera</i> spp.	Dipt: Dolychopodidae		+		Storer et al., 2004b
<b>Non-insect taxa</b>					
Snails and Pillbugs/Sowbugs	Mollusca and Crustacea (Isopoda)		+		Storer et al., 2004b

Mis en forme : Français (France)

Mis en forme : Français (France)

Mis en forme : Français (France)

Mis en forme : Français (France)

**SOUTH AFRICA****Shoot and foliage-feeders**

<i>Pissodes nemorensis</i> *	Col., Curculionidae, Molytinae	(+)	(?)	(?)	Coutinho et al. 2007
<i>Bradysia difformis</i>	Diptera, Sciaridae	(?)			Hurley et al. 2007

**CHILE****Bark beetles and wood borers**

<i>Hylastes ater</i> *	Col., Curculionidae, Scolytinae	(+)			Wingfield et al. 2008
------------------------	---------------------------------	-----	--	--	-----------------------

**JAPAN**

None (? , see text)					Viljoen et al. 1997
---------------------	--	--	--	--	---------------------

**SPAIN****Bark beetles and wood borers**

<i>Hylastes attenuatus</i>	Col., Curculionidae, Scolytinae	(+)	+		Romón et al. 2007
<i>Hylurgops palliatus</i>	Col., Curculionidae, Scolytinae	(+)	+		Romón et al. 2007
<i>Hypothenemus eruditus</i>	Col., Curculionidae, Scolytinae	(+)	+		Romón et al. 2007
<i>Ips sexdentatus</i>	Col., Curculionidae, Scolytinae	(+)	+		Romón et al. 2007
<i>Orthotomicus erosus</i>	Col., Curculionidae, Scolytinae	(+)	+		Romón et al. 2007
<i>Pissodes castaneus</i>	Col., Curculionidae, Molytinae	(+)	+		Iturrutxa et al. 2011
<i>Pityophthorus pubescens</i>	Col., Curculionidae, Scolytinae	(+)	+		Romón et al. 2007, Iturrutxa et al. 2011
<i>Tomicus piniperda</i>	Col., Curculionidae, Scolytinae	(+)	+		Iturrutxa et al. 2011

**Cone insects**

<i>Pissodes validirostris</i>	Col., Curculionidae, Molytinae	+	(?)		Roques et al. 2004, Lennox et al. 2009
-------------------------------	--------------------------------	---	-----	--	--

**Root borers**

<i>Brachyderes incanus</i>	Col., Curculionidae, Entiminae	(+)	+		Romón et al. 2007
----------------------------	--------------------------------	-----	---	--	-------------------

<sup>a</sup> Nature of association: +, confirmed association; (+), presumed association not yet verified; (?), suspected but less likely or unknown association (for details see text)

Table 2. Insects present in New Zealand that may act as associates with *Fusarium circinatum*.

Species (* non-indigenous sp.)	Family (subfamily)	Origin (native region)	Attacks live (L) or dead plants (D) <sup>a</sup>	Potential pitch canker association <sup>b</sup>
<b>Bark beetles and wood borers</b>				
<i>Hylastes ater</i> *	Curculionidae, Scolytinae	Europe	(L) <sup>a</sup> D	W, C
<i>Hylurgus ligniperda</i> *	Curculionidae, Scolytinae	Europe	D	C
<i>Pachycotes peregrinus</i>	Curculionidae, Scolytinae	NZ	D	C
<i>Platypus apicalis</i>	Curculionidae, Platypodinae	NZ	D	C
<i>Arhopalus ferus</i> *	Cerambycidae	Europe	(L) <sup>a</sup> D	(W), C
<i>Calliprason pallidus</i>	Cerambycidae	NZ	D	C
<i>Hexatricha pulverulenta</i>	Cerambycidae	NZ	(L) <sup>a</sup> D	C
<i>Oemona hirta</i>	Cerambycidae	NZ	(L) <sup>a</sup> D	(W), (C)
<i>Prionoplus reticularis</i>	Cerambycidae	NZ	D	C
<i>Ernobius mollis</i> *	Anobiidae	Cosmopolitan	D	C
<i>Sirex noctilio</i> *	Siricidae	Europe	L	C
<i>Mitrastethus baridioides</i>	Curculionidae, Cryptorhynchinae	NZ	D	(C)
<i>Pycnomerus sophorae</i>	Colydiidae	NZ	D	(C)
<b>Shoot and foliage-feeders</b>				
<i>Pseudocoremia suavis</i>	Geometridae	NZ	L	W, (C)
<i>Hierodoris atychioides</i>	Oecophoridae	NZ	L	W, (C)
<i>Ctenopseustis obliquana</i>	Tortricidae	NZ	L	W, (C)
<i>Epiphyas postvittana</i> *	Tortricidae	Australia	L	W, (C)
<i>Planotortrix notophaea</i>	Tortricidae	NZ	L	W, (C)
<b>Sapsuckers</b>				
<i>Pineus boemeri</i> *	Adelgidae	USA	L	(W), (C)
<i>P. pini</i> *	Adelgidae	Europe	L	(W), (C)
<i>Essigella californica</i> *	Aphididae	USA	L	(W), (C)
<i>Eulachnus brevipilosus</i> *	Aphididae	Europe	L	(W), (C)
<i>Heliothrips haemorrhoidalis</i> *	Thripidae	Cosmopolitan?	L	(W), (C)
<b>Cone insects</b>				
<i>Erechthias fulguritella</i>	Tineidae	NZ	(?)	(?)

<sup>a</sup> *Hylates ater* sometimes attacks pine seedlings for maturation feeding; *Arhopalus ferus* has been recorded as attacking live trees but this is rare and probably limited to fire-damaged trees; *Hexatricha pulverulenta* sometimes breeds in pines, always dead trees, but occasionally it feeds on green twigs of pine (Bain and Hosking 1988);

*Oemona hirta* is normally associated with hardwood trees and attacks of softwoods are very rare (Hosking 1978).

<sup>b</sup> Possible association in case of establishment of *F. circinatum* in New Zealand: W, wounding agent of live trees; C, carrier; V, vector; values in brackets indicate uncertainty of association; (see text for details).



Table 3. Most promising candidate agents for biocontrol of *Pinus contorta* in New Zealand<sup>a</sup>, their characteristics, and potential for involvement with the pitch canker disease.

Species	Family (subfamily)	Host range <sup>b</sup>	Host structures attacked	Potential pitch canker association <sup>c</sup>
<b>Coleoptera</b>				
<i>Conophthorus ponderosae</i>	Curculionidae	<i>Pinus</i> spp., not <i>P. radiata</i>	Only seed cones	W, C, (V)
<i>Ernobius nigrans</i>	Anobiidae	<i>Pinus</i> spp., not <i>P. radiata</i>	Only seed cones	W, C, (V)
<i>Paratimia conicola</i>	Cerambycidae	<i>Pinus</i> spp., not <i>P. radiata</i>	Only seed cones	W, C, (V)
<i>Pissodes validirostris</i>	Curculionidae	<i>Pinus</i> spp., not <i>P. radiata</i> <sup>c</sup>	Mainly seed cones <sup>d</sup>	W, C, (V)
<b>Lepidoptera</b>				
<i>Cydia toreuta</i>	Tortricidae	<i>Pinus</i> spp., not <i>P. radiata</i>	Only seed cones	W, C, (V?)
<i>Eucosma rescissoriana</i>	Tortricidae	<i>Pinus</i> and <i>Abies</i> spp., not <i>P. radiata</i>	Only seed cones	W, C, (V?)

<sup>a</sup> Preliminary selection of potential agents according to Brockerhoff and Kay (1998) and Brockerhoff et al. (2004)

<sup>b</sup> Host range information based on Keen (1958), Hedlin et al. (1980) and other publications listed in Brockerhoff and Kay (1998).

<sup>c</sup> Depending on the subspecies / host race of *P. validirostris* (see text).

<sup>d</sup> Maturation feeding, apparently causing little damage, may occur on shoots (see text).

<sup>e</sup> Possible association in case of establishment of *Fusarium circinatum* in New Zealand: W, wounding agent of live trees; C, carrier; V, vector; values in brackets indicate uncertainty of association; (for details see text)