



**HAL**  
open science

## Diverse agricultural landscapes increase bat activity and diversity: Implications for biological pest control

Axelle Tortosa, Brice Giffard, Luc L. Barbaro, Jérémy S.P. Froidevaux, Sylvie Ladet, Jeanne Delhommel, A. Vialatte

### ► To cite this version:

Axelle Tortosa, Brice Giffard, Luc L. Barbaro, Jérémy S.P. Froidevaux, Sylvie Ladet, et al.. Diverse agricultural landscapes increase bat activity and diversity: Implications for biological pest control. *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment*, 2023, 345, pp.108318. 10.1016/j.agee.2022.108318 . hal-03909028

**HAL Id: hal-03909028**

<https://hal.inrae.fr/hal-03909028v1>

Submitted on 4 Jan 2023

**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.



Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution - NonCommercial - NoDerivatives 4.0 International License

1 Diverse agricultural landscapes increase bat activity and  
2 diversity: implications for biological pest control.

3 Axelle Tortosa <sup>a</sup>, Brice Giffard <sup>b</sup>, Luc Barbaro <sup>a,c</sup>, Jérémy S.P. Froidevaux <sup>c,d</sup>, Sylvie Ladet  
4 <sup>a</sup>, Jeanne Delhommel <sup>a</sup>, Aude Vialatte <sup>a</sup>.

5

6 <sup>a</sup> Université de Toulouse, INRAE, DYNAFOR, Castanet-Tolosan, France

7 <sup>b</sup> Bordeaux Sciences Agro, INRAE, ISVV, SAVE, F-33140, Villenave d'Ornon, France

8 <sup>c</sup> CESCO, Muséum national d'Histoire naturelle, CNRS, Sorbonne University,  
9 Paris/Concarneau, France

10 <sup>d</sup> University of Stirling, Biological and Environmental Sciences, Faculty of Natural  
11 Sciences, Stirling, UK

12

13 Corresponding author : Tortosa Axelle. E-mail : [axelle.tortosa@inrae.fr](mailto:axelle.tortosa@inrae.fr) ORCID: **0000-**  
14 **0002-8668-4559**.

15

16 ORCID ID of authors :

17 Brice GIFFARD : **0000-0003-4367-1245**


18 Luc BARBARO : **0000-0001-7454-5765**



19 Jérémy FROIDEVAUX : **0000-0001-6850-4879**

20 Sylvie LADET : **0000-0002-3079-9453**

21 Aude VIALATTE : **0000-0003-2614-2472**

22



 Bat activity ?  
 Biological pest control ?

Simplified versus diversified landscapes, does the continuity of pest resources in diversified landscapes favour bats and biological control ?

24 **Abstract**

25 Diverse landscapes consisting of mixed crops are expected to support higher biological  
26 control, while also contributing to maintain farmland biodiversity. Although bats are known  
27 as predators of many farming pests, few studies to date have investigated how their  
28 foraging activity may enhance natural pest control.

29 Here, we tested the hypothesis that crop mosaics would provide a temporal continuity in  
30 prey availability for bats, ultimately resulting in higher biological control. We sampled bat  
31 activity and diversity, and the abundance and damage of three major pests of vineyards,  
32 maize, and pine plantations, in both simple and diverse landscapes mixing the three  
33 production types. Bat species richness and total activity were higher in vineyards and  
34 pine plantations located within diverse landscapes. Bat foraging activity also peaked  
35 within diverse landscapes. In vineyards, moth abundance decreased with bat species  
36 richness. In pine plantations, pest damage decreased with bat foraging activity. In maize  
37 fields, pest abundance and damage increased with bat richness and activity longer-term  
38 investigations would be necessary to assess their actual effectiveness.

39 Our study advocates for promoting a diversity of coexisting crops within agricultural  
40 landscapes to enhance bat activity and diversity, which in turn would sustain higher  
41 biological control and bolster biodiversity conservation in farmland.

42

43 **Keywords :** Farmland, crop mosaic, Chiroptera, conservation, pest insects,  
44 *Lepidoptera*, *Lobesia botrana*, *Sesamia nonagrioides*, *Thaumetopoea pityocampa*.

45

## 46        **1. Introduction**

47    The intensification of agricultural production systems, by increased use of chemical  
48    inputs, landscape simplification and homogenization of the crop mosaic, has led to a  
49    dramatic decrease in farmland biodiversity (Benton et al., 2003; Flynn et al., 2009; Geiger  
50    et al., 2010; Tilman et al., 2011; Tscharntke et al., 2005). These negative effects are  
51    suspected to threaten the long-term stability of ecological processes involved in  
52    ecosystem services limiting sustainability and resilience of agroecosystems (Cadotte et  
53    al., 2011). It is therefore urgent to develop a form of agriculture that is more oriented  
54    towards ecological intensification. In particular, farmland biodiversity supports many  
55    ecosystem services such as pest control (Dainese et al., 2019; Tscharntke et al., 2012),  
56    which has traditionally been a costly challenge for farmers given that pests are  
57    responsible for around 20% of yield losses irrespective of crop types (Duflot et al., 2022;  
58    Oerke, 2006). Arthropod pests are also acknowledged as a major threat to forest health,  
59    and are likely to worsen with severe outbreaks due to global change (Simler-Williamson  
60    et al., 2019).

61    Pest infestations are known to increase in monoculture landscapes, but it is also greater  
62    in more favourable landscapes, i.e., when the proportion of host crop cover is higher  
63    within the crop mosaic and/or is increasingly connected (Rand et al., 2014; Veres et al.,  
64    2013). Moreover, biological control of pests by their natural enemies tends to be less  
65    effective in simplified landscapes, i.e. crop-dominated landscapes, because the effect of  
66    local management often interacts with landscape complexity (Rusch et al., 2016). While  
67    the role of semi-natural habitats on biological control has been intensively studied, the  
68    benefits of crop diversity itself are less well understood (Veres et al., 2013). It is now  
69    widely established that landscape spatio-temporal heterogeneity enhances multitrophic  
70    abundance and diversity of natural enemies (Sirami et al., 2019) in part by promoting  
71    complementary resources for natural enemies, including foraging areas, food sources,

72 shelter, nesting and overwintering sites (Bertrand et al., 2016; Schellhorn et al., 2015).  
73 However, the actual consequences in terms of biological pest control remain inconsistent  
74 across regions, sites and experiments, probably due to complex interactions between  
75 farming practices and landscape context leading to synergistic or antagonistic effects  
76 (Barbaro et al., 2017; Etienne et al., 2022; Muneret et al., 2019; Ricci et al., 2019).  
77 Although the relationship between natural enemy diversity and the effectiveness of  
78 biological pest control is generally positive, it can be substantially disrupted by, e.g., intra-  
79 guild predation within the natural enemy community (Letourneau et al., 2009; Martin et  
80 al., 2013).

81 Insectivorous bats are efficient natural enemies of key pest arthropods in temperate  
82 agroecosystems and forest ecosystems (Ancillotto et al., 2022; Blažek et al., 2021; Boyles  
83 et al., 2011; McCracken et al., 2012). For instance, they are both efficient in annual crops  
84 such as maize fields (Aizpurua et al., 2018; Maine & Boyles, 2015; Whitby et al., 2020)  
85 and perennial crops such as vineyards and orchards or in plantation forests (Charbonnier  
86 et al., 2014, 2021). In agricultural landscapes, most bat species rely on woody features  
87 for commuting and foraging, depending on their wing morphology and echolocation  
88 strategy (Frey-Ehrenbold et al., 2013; Froidevaux et al., 2019; Garin et al., 2019), and  
89 some bats can forage above crop fields (e.g., open-space foragers; Heim et al., 2015).

90 Higher landscape diversity and shorter distances between roosting sites and other  
91 foraging habitats (e.g. water bodies, riparian zones) promote bat activity and species  
92 richness (Monck-Whipp et al., 2018; Rainho & Palmeirim, 2011). Bats are also central-  
93 place foragers as they used to return to the same site after foraging, with an average  
94 distance between foraging areas and roost for many species most often less than 3 km  
95 (Laforge et al., 2021), but occasionally up to ten of kilometres to reach high rewarding  
96 areas (Bruun & Smith, 2003). Most insectivorous bats are generalist predators that are  
97 able to maintain vital rates and stable populations by shifting to alternative prey and by

98 feeding on several adult moths. Although their foraging strategy and habitat selection (or  
99 use) are different, species belonging to different guilds have been shown to feed on the  
100 same pest moths (Garin et al., 2019).

101 Thanks to the development of new molecular analysis techniques such as DNA  
102 metabarcoding, many moth pests of both annual and perennial crops have been detected  
103 in bat diet (Aizpurua et al., 2018; Charbonnier et al., 2021). Nevertheless, these  
104 qualitative approaches only highlight pest consumption and do not allow inference about  
105 pest control (Russo et al., 2018). Several studies demonstrated the role of bats as  
106 biological control agents in specific crops such as maize or rice, using (semi-)  
107 experimental approaches (e.g. Maine & Boyles, 2015; Puig-Montserrat et al., 2015). Yet,  
108 little is known regarding the influence of the landscape and the season on bat activity  
109 resulting in more effective biological control.

110 Crop mosaic diversity at the landscape scale, i.e. agroecosystems mixing trees (forest  
111 patches, hedgerows) and crop fields, may be particularly favourable to enhance pest  
112 control provided by bats. Crop diversity is expected to increase the co-occurrence of  
113 annual and perennial crops offering complementary food and roost resources both  
114 temporally and spatially across the entire bat activity period, depending on variation in  
115 seasonal energy demands. In addition, crop diversity may benefit a large range of bat  
116 species including species with different echolocation, foraging strategies and  
117 conservation concerns. Our study focuses on whether the complementarity of three crop  
118 types, namely maize, vineyard and pine plantations, at the landscape scale, would affect  
119 bat communities and their potential usefulness in terms of biological control, i.e., is the  
120 mixture of these three crops at the landscape scale favourable to bats and does it favour  
121 biological control of pests?

122 Our first objective was to evaluate the effects of more diverse agricultural landscapes on  
123 bat community and its foraging activity. We predicted that in landscapes mixing the three

124 crops, the presence of higher diversity of landscape elements favourable for bats would  
125 provide complementary resources, resulting in higher species richness and bat activity.  
126 Our second prediction is that bat guild-specific responses are expected because crop-  
127 diverse landscapes display higher diversity in habitat structures than crop-dominated  
128 ones.

129 Finally, because we predicted that landscapes that are more diverse regarding co-  
130 occurring crop types may offer a higher food resource continuity through the succession  
131 of each lepidopteran pest biological cycle, we expected a higher foraging activity and less  
132 crop damage in these landscapes. To account for the effects of plant resource availability  
133 provided by the dominant crop on phytophagous insect abundances, we also directly  
134 assessed the abundance of other moths and other alternative bat prey.

135

## 136 **2. Material and methods**

### 137 ***2.1. Study area and site selection***

138 The study area was located in the south west of France, between Gironde and Lot-et-  
139 Garonne counties and near Langon (44° 33' 19.508" N 0° 14' 42.454" W). This area is  
140 dominated by vineyards (Sauternes and Graves vineyards), maize fields and pine  
141 plantations (mainly *Pinus pinaster*).

142 Within this study area, we selected thirty-seven landscapes (a 563-m radius scale; Figure  
143 1) according to the predominance of one or all three target crop types. Thirty landscapes  
144 were dominated by only one of the three crops, i.e. 10 simplified landscapes dominated  
145 by vineyards (mean: 70%; range 57%-78%), maize fields (mean: 52%; range 21%-76%,  
146 without any other dominant crop) or pine plantations (mean: 79 %; range 63%-100%),  
147 respectively. Seven landscapes were selected that had all three crop types in varying  
148 proportions but their total surface cover was at least 45% of the total area (hereafter



149 referred to as 'diverse landscapes'). Among the 17 vineyards sampled two were  
150 organically managed and maize fields were all conventionally managed.  
151




Figure 1 : Map of the study area showing the two landscape types: simplified landscapes depending on the targeted crop (P: pine or M: maize or V: vineyards) and diverse landscapes (Div: three crops were represented).

## 152 2.2. Field sampling of targeted Lepidoptera and potential alternative prey

153 Vineyards (*Vitis vinifera* L.), maize (*Zea mays* L.) fields and pine plantations (mainly *Pinus*  
154 *pinaster*) dominate agricultural landscapes of South-western France. Key pests include  
155 the European grapevine moth *Lobesia botrana* Denis & Schiffenüller (Lepidoptera:  
156 Tortricidae), which cause direct losses in grape production (Delbac & Thiéry, 2016); the  
157 Mediterranean corn borer *Sesamia nonagrioides* Lefèbvre (Lepidoptera: Noctuidae),  
158 which is one of the most damaging pests of maize in early stages (Maine & Boyles, 2015);  
159 and the pine processionary moth *Thaumetopoea pityocampa* Denis & Schiffenüller  
160 (Lepidoptera: Notodontidae), which is the main defoliator of pines reducing growth of  
161 young trees (Jacquet et al., 2012). The flight peaks of these three species follow one  
162 another in time. The corn borer and the grape berry moth have between 2 and 4

163 generations per year, with a flight peak of the first generation at the end of April and the  
164 end of May, respectively. The control of the first generation is key to limit the abundance  
165 of the following generations. The pine processionary moth has one generation per year  
166 and a flight peak spread out between late June and early September. Current control of  
167 moth pests in crops consists of mating disruption, application of insecticide or *Bt* toxin but  
168 their effectiveness tends to decrease in a context of global warming and the appearance  
169 of resistance (Thiéry et al., 2018).

170 The data collection was carried out over three sampling periods in April, May and July  
171 2021, according to the flight peaks of the targeted lepidopteran pests in each crop and in  
172 the study region. The first sampling period was carried out in April 2021 in the 17  
173 vineyards: 10 vineyards in vineyard-dominated landscapes and 7 vineyards in diverse  
174 landscapes. We installed specific pheromone baited-traps of *L. botrana* alternatively  
175 during 7 nights from 12 to 21 April 2021, 30 m inside the fields. We also placed food traps  
176 containing diluted apple must in order to collect potential alternative prey (Figure A 1).  
177 Food traps were located 50 m away from the pheromone baited-traps in the same fields.  
178 After 7 nights, food traps were refilled and deployed for two more consecutive nights  
179 during the bat sampling.

180 The same experimental set-up was conducted in May in 16 maize fields and in July in 17  
181 pine plantations. The pheromone baited-traps specific to *S. nonagrioides* were placed  
182 from 18 to 27 May 2021 and specific to *T. pityocampa* from 28 June to 7 July 2021.

183 All insects collected in food traps were stored in a 70% ethanol solution. Among the  
184 collected insects, targeted moths, i.e. *L. botrana* or *S. nonagrioides* or *T. pityocampa*,  
185 were counted and added to those counted on pheromone baited-traps. The total relative  
186 abundance of moth species was determined in the targeted crop. The collected insects  
187 stored in ethanol were then dried for 24 hours at 60° and weighted with a precision  
188 balance. The total insect dry biomass for each site was determined.

189 **2.3. Bat monitoring**

190 The main activity period of bats ranges from spring to autumn and peaks during periods  
191 of high energy demands. For instance, after hibernation, female bats have to fulfil their  
192 reserves and ensure the rapid growth of their embryos. Therefore, pregnant females will  
193 need more food resources to achieve their pregnancy in June-July (Laforge et al., 2021).  
194 The lactation period is also a period of high energy demand, during which the females  
195 tend to forage closer to their roost and until the young forage in their turn (Arthur &  
196 Lemaire, 2015; O'Donnell, 2002).

197 Bats were recorded using an ultrasound bat detector model Elekon Batlogger A/A+  
198 (Wigum GmbH, Germany); recording was triggered automatically when sounds in the  
199 frequency range 8-192 kHz with a signal-noise-ratio level above 6 dB were detected.  
200 Detectors were programmed to record from 30 min before sunset to 30 min after sunrise.  
201 They were installed for two consecutive nights instead of the specific pheromone baited-  
202 traps, i.e. vineyards in both landscape types were sampled between 19 and 23 April 2021;  
203 maize fields between 25 and 29 May 2021; pine plantations between 5 and 9 July 2021.  
204 Bats were recorded only in nights without rain, with low wind speed (< 30 km/h) and an  
205 average minimum temperature at night of >10°C (Parsons, 2007).

206 Species identification was supported by the Tadarida software, which classified calls to  
207 the most accurate taxonomic level with a confidence index value  
208 (<https://github.com/YvesBas/Tadarida-C/>; Bas et al., 2017). As automated identification  
209 can generate significant error rates, we followed the procedure by Barré et al. (2019) in  
210 order to find the best compromise limiting species identification errors and maintaining a  
211 relatively high number of bat passes. Then, we removed acoustic data with a maximum  
212 error rate tolerance (MERT) of 0.5 to minimize false positives while keeping a high  
213 number of bat passes. We checked the consistency of responses using a more restrictive  
214 MERT of 0.1 (detailed results are available in Appendix B), which limited false positives

215 but discarded more true positives. Call identifications were grouped at genus level for  
216 *Plecotus* spp. and we distinguished small and large *Myotis* spp. (see Table 1). The  
217 number of species or complex of species were counted per site and per night. Species of  
218 regional conservation concern (SCC) were identified according to the Nouvelle-Aquitaine  
219 regional red list (see Table 1; Liste rouge des Chiroptères de Nouvelle-Aquitaine, 2019).  
220 We also grouped bats according to their echolocation range into three guilds (Frey-  
221 Ehrenbold et al., 2013; Schnitzler & Kalko, 2001) namely short-, mid- and long-range  
222 echolocators (SRE, MRE and LRE respectively - see Table 1).

223 As acoustic sampling does not allow differentiating individual bats, we used bat activity  
224 as a surrogate of bat abundance (e.g. Azam et al., 2016; Barré et al., 2019; Froidevaux  
225 et al., 2017) which was calculated by summing the number of bat passes per site and per  
226 night. Bat pass was defined as the detection of a single or several bat calls during a 5-s  
227 interval, which was the best compromise between the risk to miss an individual and to  
228 count several times the same one (Kerbirou et al., 2019; Millon et al., 2015). Global bat  
229 activity (i.e. global activity) was calculated by summing nightly bat activity of each species  
230 or complex of species. Guild activity (i.e. LRE , MRE or SRE activities) and SCC activity  
231 were also calculated by summing the number of bat passes of species or complex of  
232 species that constitute the guild and the number of bat passes of species from SCC  
233 mentioned before (Table 1), respectively.

234 Finally, we quantified bat foraging activity through the mean bat sequence duration BSD  
235 (Kerbirou et al., 2019) weighted by the number of bat sequences of each species or  
236 complex of species and of each guild (i.e. LRE BSD, MRE BSD, SRE BSD). Bat sequence  
237 duration corresponds to the total duration of a bat sequence (i.e. a series of bat calls),  
238 considering two acoustic events separated by a time interval shorter than 2 seconds as  
239 a same bat sequence. Longer bat sequences indicate that a bat is foraging while shorter  
240 bat sequences would suggest that a bat is commuting (Kerbirou et al., 2019).

241 **Table 1: List of species sampled in the study and aggregation of species used in the**  
 242 **statistical analyses.** Table shows the guild of each different sampled species (according to their  
 243 echolocation range) and their conservation concern.

Species	Complex of species	Guild	Status of species on the Nouvelle-Aquitaine red list*
<i>Nyctalus leisleri</i>	-	LRE	LC
<i>Nyctalus noctula</i>	-	LRE	VU
<i>Nyctalus lasiopterus</i>	-	LRE	VU
<i>Eptesicus serotinus</i>	-	LRE	LC
<i>Pipistrellus pipistrellus</i>	-	MRE	LC
<i>Pipistrellus kuhlii</i>	-	MRE	LC
<i>Pipistrellus nathusii</i>	-	MRE	NT
<i>Pipistrellus pygmaeus</i>	-	MRE	DD
<i>Hypsugo savii</i>	-	MRE	LC
<i>Miniopterus schreibersii</i>	-	MRE	EN
<i>Barbastella barbastellus</i>	-	SRE	LC
<i>Plecotus auritus</i>	Plecotus spp.	SRE	LC
<i>Plecotus austriacus</i>		SRE	LC
<i>Myotis blythii</i>	Large <i>Myotis</i> spp.	SRE	EN
<i>Myotis myotis</i>		SRE	LC
<i>Myotis emarginatus</i>	Small <i>Myotis</i> spp.	SRE	LC
<i>Myotis crypticus</i>		SRE	NT
<i>Myotis mystacinus</i>		SRE	DD
<i>Rhinolophus ferrumequinum</i>		-	SRE
<i>Rhinolophus hipposideros</i>	-	SRE	LC

LRE : Long-range echolocators; MRE : Mid-range echolocators; SRE: Short-range echolocators  
 LC: Least concern; NT: Near threatened; VU: Vulnerable; EN: Endangered; DD: Data deficient

244

245

#### 246 **2.4. Evaluation of specific damage in targeted crops**

247 Specific damage was evaluated in maize and pine plantations to estimate the actual  
 248 effects of bat predation on target lepidopterans. Damage in vineyards (glomerules on  
 249 grape bunches) could not be assessed due to a frost episode that occurred at the  
 250 beginning of April (2021) and greatly affected vegetative development of the grapevines.  
 251 Maize damage was evaluated the fortnight following bat sampling that corresponded to  
 252 10-15 days after 50% of the *S. nonagrioides* peak flying (maximum of adult emergence)  
 253 and to the maximum of larvae at the crawler stage. Three transects of 100 maize plants  
 254 were observed in each field and the plants showing wilting were counted to assess larvae  
 255 densities per field and per 100 plants (maize densities equal in all our fields).

256 In early February 2022, we estimated the density of larval colonies of *T. pityocampa* by  
257 counting the number of larval colonies on all pine trees located 100 m from the forest  
258 edge and on the first two rows where the larval colonies are concentrated (Dulaurent et  
259 al., 2012).

260

## 261 **2.5. Landscape metrics**

262 Using ArcGIS Desktop 10.5.1 software (ESRI, Redlands, CA, US), land cover was  
263 digitized from OSO 2019 (Inglada et al., 2017) and annual crops were identified for the  
264 study sites based on direct field observations.

265 Part of the landscape metrics were then calculated for a 1km<sup>2</sup> circle (i.e., inside a circular  
266 buffer with radius of 563m, centred on the middle of the pheromone baited-trap and  
267 acoustic detector position). First, we used a descriptive variable (i.e. landscape type) to  
268 distinguish the type of landscape in which the measurements were made, i.e. either  
269 simplified (dominance of one targeted crop) or diverse (presence of all three crops).

270 To describe crop mosaic compositional heterogeneity, the proportion of each targeted  
271 crop (vineyards, maize fields and pine plantations) was assessed and the Shannon crop-  
272 diversity index was specifically calculated on those categories. Another Shannon diversity  
273 index was calculated for the whole landscape based on the proportion of each land cover  
274 (other habitats than crops such as deciduous woodlands, water bodies, building,  
275 hedgerows with mainly deciduous trees) but it was highly correlated with the Shannon  
276 crop-diversity index of specific crops (Pearson's coefficient > 0.9), and was therefore  
277 disregarded for the analysis. The compositional heterogeneity of the semi-natural habitats  
278 (SNH) was described using the proportion of SNH, which grouped hedgerows, woodlands  
279 and water bodies and we also calculated the total length of hedgerows, which represented  
280 an indicator of configuration heterogeneity. The proportion covered by artificial spaces

281 (i.e. buildings, roads, commercial and industrial areas) was calculated to consider the  
282 potential effect of artificialization.

283 As bats have a dispersal capacity from a breeding site to a foraging zone that may reach  
284 several tens of kilometres depending on the species, we chose to consider the distance  
285 to the nearest elements of the landscape with potentially significant effects on the  
286 sampled bat community (Laforge et al., 2021). Then we used the distances to the nearest  
287 water body, hedgerow, forest edge, riparian zone and building (Arthur & Lemaire, 2015;  
288 Froidevaux et al., 2019; Laforge et al., 2021; Sirami et al., 2013). The distance to the  
289 Garonne, the main water body of the study area, was also considered (Salvarina, 2016;  
290 Salvarina et al., 2018). The distribution of landscape metrics is available in Appendix A  
291 (Table A 2).

292

## 293 **2.6. Statistical analysis**

294 Spearman's correlations were performed on the different response variables in order to  
295 evaluate potential redundancies. All rho coefficients were below 0.7, except between total  
296 bat activity and MRE activity (Figure A 3).

297 To assess the influence of landscape type (monoculture vs three-type crop mosaic) on  
298 bat community activity and foraging activity, we performed statistical analyses on both (i)  
299 the pooled dataset of the three sampling periods, and (ii) each separate dataset  
300 corresponding to the sampling in April, May and July respectively. Firstly, we tested  
301 independently the relationships between all response variables (i.e. bat species richness,  
302 global activity, SCC activity, guild activity and foraging activity) and the landscape type  
303 (crop-dominated versus diverse), using Generalized Linear Mixed-Effect Models  
304 (GLMMs; *lme4* package) with the appropriate distribution (Gaussian or Poisson or  
305 negative binomial family) and considering site and night as random effects.

306 Secondly, independent variables (landscape metrics, biomass and relative pest  
307 abundance) were standardized. Pearson's correlations ( $|r| < 0.7$ ) and collinearity with  
308 variation inflation factor (VIF values  $< 5$ ) were tested using the *corvif* function (Zuur et al.,  
309 2009) for each period. Then, we modelled relationships between the response variables  
310 and different independent landscape variables depending on the landscape context of  
311 each targeted crop (Table 2) and co-variables such as biomass or relative abundance of  
312 targeted pest. We used GLMMs to create the full model, and then the *dredge* function  
313 (*MuMin* package) was run with a maximum of three independent variables in the same  
314 model to avoid model overparametrization, and site and night as random factors. We  
315 selected models with a  $\Delta AICc < 2$  and averaged coefficients were calculated using  
316 *model.avg* function (*MuMin* package). Distance-dependence in all model residuals was  
317 assessed using Moran's I test and appeared to be not spatially related (Moran's I test, all  
318  $p > 0.05$ ).

319 Finally, Spearman's correlations were calculated between the relative pest abundance  
320 and the index of damage for maize and pine plantations sampling periods. We also  
321 investigated correlation relationships between variables describing bat community or  
322 activity and relative pest abundances and the associated index of damage for each  
323 sampling period. Wilcoxon's tests were performed for the different variables responses  
324 and between landscape types.

325 All analyses were performed with R software version 3.6.3 (R Core Team, 2022).

326



327 **Table 2: Description of the landscape metrics, co-variables and random factors used for**  
 328 **each analysis, according to the dataset.**

Dataset	Landscape metrics	Other co-variables	Random factor
<b>All</b> N= 99 (50 sites x 2 nights*)	Landscape type (crop-dominated landscapes VS landscapes with the three crops)	-	(1 Site) + (1  Night)
<b>Vineyards</b> n= 34 (17 sites x 2 nights)	Shannon diversity of crops %SNH %Artificial Length of hedgerows Distance to the nearest building Distance to the nearest hedgerow Distance to the nearest riparian zone Distance to the Garonne Distance to the nearest forest edge	Biomass  Relative pest abundance (number of <i>L. botrana</i> )	(1 Site) + (1  Night)
<b>Maize fields</b> N= 32 (16 sites x 2 nights)	Shannon diversity of crops %SNH Length of hedgerows Distance to the nearest building Distance to the nearest riparian zone Distance to the Garonne Distance to the nearest forest edge Distance to the nearest water body	Biomass  Relative pest abundance (number of <i>S. nonagrioides</i> )	(1 Site) + (1  Night)
<b>Pine plantations</b> N= 33 (17 sites x 2 nights*)	Shannon diversity of crops %SNH Length of hedgerows Distance to the nearest hedgerow Distance to the nearest water body	Relative pest abundance (number of <i>T. pityocampa</i> )	(1 Site) + (1  Night)

\*Acoustic recording failed one night in pine plantations, therefore the total number of recording nights is 99 instead of 100.

330 **3. Results**

331 **3.1. Bat, pest and plant damage**

332 **3.1.1. Bat richness and activity**

333 We recorded a total of 17,786 and 13,386 bat passes, considering a MERT of 0.5 and a  
334 MERT of 0.9, that belonged to 16 taxa (Table 3). The average species richness was 7.4  
335 ( $\pm 1.8$ ) species in vineyards; 6.4 ( $\pm 2.3$ ) in maize fields and 6.1 ( $\pm 1.7$ ) in pine plantations.  
336 Bat activity was mainly represented by MRE guild (72%) with the *Pipistrellus* genus as  
337 most frequently genus detected (39% *Pipistrellus pipistrellus*, 29% *Pipistrellus kuhlii*).  
338 LRE and SRE guilds represented 22% and 6% of total bat activity; *Nyctalus leisleri* and  
339 *Eptesicus serotinus* represented each 11% of recorded activity.

340 Keeping bat passes with an error rate of less than 50%, i.e. a MERT of 0.5, there were  
341 14 bat passes of species of conservation concern compared to only two bat passes when  
342 considering an identification error rate of less than 10%, i.e. a MERT of 0.1.

343 Foraging activity varied from 0.05s to 0.81s (mean for MERT of 0.5: 0.40s; LRE foraging  
344 activity: 0.14s  $\pm$  0.09; MRE foraging activity: 0.23s  $\pm$  0.10; SRE foraging activity: 0.14s  $\pm$   
345 0.10).

346

347 **Table 3: Guild and species bat activity with a maximum error rate tolerance of 0.5 (and a**  
 348 **maximum error rate tolerance of 0.1 in brackets), i.e. number of bat passes recorded for**  
 349 **each sampling period.**

Taxa	Vineyards	Maize fields	Pine plantations	<i>Total</i>
<b>Long-range echolocators - LRE</b>	<b>810 (619)</b>	<b>531 (358)</b>	<b>2 691 (1 459)</b>	<b>4 032 (2 436)</b>
<i>Nyctalus leisleri</i>	679 (589)	290 (233)	1 047 (804)	2 016 (1 626)
<i>Nyctalus noctula</i>	4 (1)	11 (8)	0	15 (9)
<i>Nyctalus lasiopterus</i>	0	14 (0)	0	14 (0)
<i>Eptesicus serotinus</i>	127 (29)	216 (117)	1 644 (655)	1 987 (801)
<b>Mid-range echolocators - MRE</b>	<b>2 167 (1 716)</b>	<b>3 869 (2 834)</b>	<b>6 681 (5 680)</b>	<b>12 717 (10 230)</b>
<i>Pipistrellus pipistrellus</i>	1 209 (1 104)	2 268 (1 917)	3 415 (3 052)	6 892 (6 073)
<i>Pipistrellus kuhlii</i>	737 (572)	1 302 (903)	3 138 (2 628)	5 177 (4 103)
<i>Pipistrellus nathusii</i>	200 (29)	286 (14)	122 (0)	608 (43)
<i>Pipistrellus pygmaeus</i>	11 (6)	2 (0)	0	13 (6)
<i>Hypsugo savii</i>	6 (2)	10 (0)	6 (0)	22 (2)
<i>Miniopterus schreibersii</i>	4 (3)	1 (0)	0	5 (3)
<b>Short-range echolocators - SRE</b>	<b>250 (152)</b>	<b>456 (323)</b>	<b>331 (205)</b>	<b>1 037 (680)</b>
<i>Barbastella barbastellus</i>	78 (73)	306 (279)	117 (72)	501 (424)
<i>Plecotus</i> spp.	81 (15)	123 (31)	110 (44)	314 (90)
Small <i>Myotis</i> spp.	16 (2)	3 (0)	23 (12)	42 (14)
Large <i>Myotis</i> spp.	14 (6)	14 (6)	2 (0)	30 (12)
<i>Rhinolophus ferrumequinum</i>	9 (9)	5 (3)	59 (58)	73 (70)
<i>Rhinolophus hipposideros</i>	52 (47)	5 (4)	20 (19)	77 (70)
<b>Total</b>	<b>3 227</b> (2 487)	<b>4 856</b> (3 515)	<b>9 703</b> (7 344)	<b>17 786</b> (13 386)

351           3.1.2. *Pest abundance and alternative prey biomass*


352   The number of *L. botrana* counted on pheromone baited-traps in vineyards, in April 2021  
353   ranged from zero to six individuals (mean:  $0.23 \pm 0.19$ ; Figure 2A ). Relative abundance  
354   of *L. botrana* was the lowest among the three targeted lepidopteran pests. The mean dry  
355   biomass was 0.25g ( $\pm 0.30$ ).

356   In May 2021, *S. nonagrioides* counted in maize fields ranged from zero to 22 individuals  
357   per site (mean:  $3.50 \pm 5.56$ ; Figure 2B). The mean dry biomass measured was 0.23 g ( $\pm$   
358   0.19).

359   Finally, in July 2021, the number of *T. pityocampa* ranged from 0 to 46 individuals per site  
360   (mean:  $8.41 \pm 11.11$ ; Figure 2C). The mean dry biomass measured was 0.56 g ( $\pm 1.45$ )  
361   and the highest among the three sampling periods.

362   There was no significant difference between the relative abundances of pests in crop-  
363   dominated landscapes and in diverse landscapes (Figure 2), for each sampling period.

364



**Figure 2 : Relative abundance of the three targeted moths in the crops they were specialist about. Respectively (A) in vineyards (April) for *L. botrana*; (B) in maize fields (May) for *S. nonagrioides*; (C) in pine plantations (July) for *T. pityocampa*. N corresponded to the number of landscapes considered for each modality.**

366            *3.1.3. Plant damage*

367    The damage index measured on maize plants was very low ranging from zero to 0.02,  
368    which corresponded to a maximum of six affected plants out of 300 observed.

369    The density of larval colonies of the pine processionary moth, varied among sites between  
370    0 to 25 nests per site. Depending on the site, the total number of pines observed varied  
371    from 21 to 108 trees, with an average around 50 trees per site, leading to an index of  
372    damage ranging from zero to 0.61.

373    The index of damage calculated for pine plantations was significantly lower in diverse  
374    landscapes than in pine-dominated landscapes (Wilcoxon's test:  $W = 198$ ,  $p\text{-value} =$   
375    0.019).

376

377    ***3.2. Effects of landscape diversity on bat communities***

378    Results exposed in this paragraph correspond to response variables using a MERT of 0.5  
379    in automated identification (for MERT of 0.1 results, see Table B 1).

380    Bat species richness was always higher in diverse than in simple landscapes (Table 4;  
381    Figure 3).

382    Total bat activity was significantly influenced by landscape type (Table 4; Figure 3). It was  
383    largely driven by the activity of MRE guild, which was also significantly higher in diverse  
384    than simple landscapes, as well as activity of species of conservation concern (Table 4).

385    The total foraging activity, was not significantly influenced by the landscape type.

386    However when considering guild foraging activity, SRE foraging activity was significantly  
387    longer in diverse landscapes.

388

389 Table 4: **Estimates and standards errors ( $\pm$  SE) of the effect of landscape type**  
 390 **variable on species richness and bat activity (3 sampling periods combined, n =**  
 391 **99).** MRE: Mid-Range Echolocators; SRE: Short-Range Echolocators; SCC: Species of Conservation  
 392 Concern; BSD: Bat Sequence Duration.  
 393 Marginal R<sup>2</sup>, i.e., variance explained by the fixed effects only, are given for GLMMs and \* p <  
 394 0.05; \*\* p < 0.01 and \*\*\* p < 0.001.

	Response variable	Estimate ( $\pm$ SE)	z-value or t-value	P-value	Marginal R <sup>2</sup>
Bat community	Species richness Gaussian family	1.01 ( $\pm$ 0.43)	2.35	0.023*	0.07
Bat activity	Total activity Negative binomial family	0.60 ( $\pm$ 0.23)	2.61	0.009**	0.08
	MRE activity Poisson family	0.58 ( $\pm$ 0.28)	2.09	0.037*	0.04
	SCC activity Poisson family	1.23 ( $\pm$ 0.45)	2.75	0.006**	0.14
Foraging activity	SRE BSD Gaussian family	0.05 ( $\pm$ 0.02)	2.01	0.045*	0.06

395




Figure 3: Bat species richness (A) and total bat activity (B - data log transformed) depending on landscape type. (\*\* p < 0.01, \*\*\*\* p < 0.0001)

396

### 397 3.3. Effects of crop diversity and pest abundance on bat communities in vineyards

398 Bat activity in vineyards in April increased with crop diversity and decreased with distance  
 399 to the nearest hedgerow (Figure A 4). Crop diversity had also a positive effect on  
 400 endangered bat species.

401 MRE activity followed the same pattern as total bat activity and peaked in diverse  
402 landscapes. LRE activity was positively related to the distance to the largest river and  
403 negatively to the distance to the nearest hedgerow.

404 In addition, the relative abundance of pest *L. botrana* was negatively correlated with bat  
405 species richness (Figure A 5; A 8) and SRE foraging activity.

406

### 407 ***3.4. Effects of crop diversity and pest abundance on bat communities in maize*** 408 ***fields, consequences on plant damage***

409 In maize fields in May, bat species richness was influenced positively by the proportion  
410 of semi-natural habitats (SNH) and negatively by the total length of hedgerows (Figure A  
411 6, Table B 2).

412 Total bat activity in maize fields significantly increased with the length of hedgerows and  
413 closer to forest edges and decreased closer to the riparian zone (Figure A 6, Table B 2).

414 Bat guild activity was driven by MRE activity, which was influenced positively by the  
415 distance to the nearest forest edge and negatively by the distance to the nearest riparian  
416 zone. SRE activity significantly decreased with the total length of hedgerows (Figure A 6;  
417 Table B 2). The activity of species of conservation concern in maize fields was significantly  
418 and positively related to the distance to the nearest riparian zone. In addition, the  
419 proportion of SNH and the crop diversity index had a significant positive effect on SCC  
420 activity (Figure A 6; Table B 2).

421 Bat foraging activity was slightly but significantly positively influenced by the relative  
422 abundance of *S. nonagrioides* and negatively influenced by the distance to the main river.

423 Considering foraging activity through guild classification, SRE foraging activity was  
424 negatively affected by the length of hedgerows and positively affected by the proportion  
425 of SNH and relative pest abundance. In addition, insect dry biomass and crop diversity  
426 had significant positive effects on LRE foraging activity (Figure A 6; Table B 2).



427 The abundance of *S. nonagrioides* in sampled maize fields was positively correlated with  
428 bat species richness (Figure A 6; A 8; Table B 3), SRE activity SRE and LRE foraging  
429 activities. Total bat activity was not significantly correlated with the index of damage on  
430 maize plants (Figure 4) whereas SCC activity and LRE foraging activity were positively  
431 correlated to the maize damage index (Table B 4).

432


### 433 ***3.5. Effects of crop diversity and pest abundance on bat communities in pine*** 434 ***plantations, consequences for tree damage***

435 In pine plantations in July, bat species richness significantly increased with crop diversity  
436 and decreased with the total length of hedgerows. Bat activity increased with crop  
437 diversity and distance to the nearest hedgerow, while activity of endangered bats only  
438 increased with crop diversity.

439 MRE activity was positively influenced in the same way as global bat activity. SRE activity  
440 was positively influenced by the three-crops Shannon diversity index and negatively by  
441 the total length of hedgerows (Figure A 7; Table B 2). The three-crops Shannon diversity  
442 index affected positively the SCC activity (Figure A 7; Table B 2).

443 Bat foraging activity increased with the distance to the nearest hedgerow and crop  
444 diversity index. Relative abundance of *T. pityocampa* in sampled pine plantations was  
445 positively correlated with the index of damage measured on pine plantations but only in  
446 pine-dominated landscapes (Table B 4). Total foraging activity and especially MRE  
447 foraging activity were negatively correlated with the damage index (Figure 4, Table B 4).

448



**Figure 4: Relationships between total bat activity and damage index in maize fields in May (A) and in pine plantations in July (B), especially MRE foraging activity (C). Red points represent sampled points in maize- or pine plantations- dominated landscapes while blue points represent sampled points in diverse landscapes.**

## 450        **4. Discussion**

451        While more and more studies highlight the importance of landscape complexity for bats  
452        (e.g. Allegrini et al., 2022; Krings et al., 2022; Ocampo-Ariza et al., 2022), there are still  
453        few studies that highlight their potential role in pest control within agricultural landscapes  
454        (Russo et al., 2018).

455        This study provides evidence for the positive effect of the diversity of the crop mosaic at  
456        the landscape scale on bat richness and activity. The novelty of the study relies in  
457        focusing the approach on the biological control of three pests at key periods for bats in  
458        agricultural landscapes, and allowed us highlighting their effective role in natural pest  
459        control. In line with our hypotheses, our results suggest bat guild-dependent responses.  
460        On the one hand, long-range echolocators foraging activity was higher with pest  
461        abundance and damage index in maize fields. On the other hand, damage index on pine  
462        trees decreased with mid-range echolocators activity. These findings highlight the  
463        importance of landscape scale and pest control-centred approaches together with studies  
464        analysing bat diet, in order to quantify the role of bats in agricultural landscapes and to  
465        identify conservation actions.

### 466        ***4.1. More diverse landscapes foster bat species richness and activity***

467        Our models revealed that species richness and bat activity, especially mid-range  
468        echolocators activity (mainly *Pipistrellus* spp.) were higher in the more diverse landscapes  
469        mixing more or less equally the three target crop types. These results corroborate with  
470        Monck-Whipp et al. (2018), who found that diverse agricultural landscapes improved both  
471        bat species richness and activity.

472        There are three main hypotheses explaining positive effects of crop diversity on species  
473        richness, bat activity and to a lesser extent on foraging activity. First, more diverse  
474        landscapes typically combined perennial and annual crops that may provide more diverse  
475        and abundant prey spatially within the landscape and over the time, especially for highly

476 mobile taxa (Bertrand et al., 2016; Fahrig et al., 2015; Laforge et al., 2021). Particularly  
477 in our study design we hypothesised a temporal continuity in abundance of moth pests,  
478 whose flight peaks narrowly followed each other within the three crop types during the  
479 entire bat activity period. In diverse landscapes, prey abundance is likely to be more  
480 stable through the night as different species are active at different time in different habitats  
481 (Rydell et al., 1996). Second, bats also depend on non-substitutable key resources, such  
482 as daylight roosting sites. Diverse landscapes, especially those combining trees and  
483 crops may provide these complementary resources year-on-year and then the proximity  
484 of foraging and roosting habitats may benefit both species richness and bat activity.  
485 Finally, the combination of annual and perennial crops, which have different phenologies  
486 and varying cover heights, offers a three-dimensional structure of the landscape. It is  
487 widely accepted that the different bat species do not commute and forage in the same  
488 way within the landscape according to their wing morphology and echolocation  
489 capabilities (Frey-Ehrenbold et al., 2013; Fuentes- Montemayor et al., 2011). Therefore,  
490 landscapes with such three-dimensional structure may be favourable to a larger range of  
491 bat species classified into different guilds and will increase their activity. Furthermore,  
492 landscape elements such as forest edges or hedgerows contribute to landscape  
493 connectivity especially for bats belonging to SRE guild, which includes species that are  
494 relatively sensitive to landscape fragmentation and more active in well-connected  
495 landscapes (Fill et al., 2022; Frey-Ehrenbold et al., 2013).

496 In addition to the importance of a more diverse agricultural landscape in terms of crops,  
497 our study also showed the influence of the presence and the distance to semi-natural  
498 habitats, which is consistent with previous studies (e.g. Laforge et al., 2021). Surprisingly,  
499 we found that a higher length of hedgerows was associated with a bat species richness  
500 decrease at the local scale, maybe due to less foraging bats gathering in optimal areas  
501 when hedgerow availability is low at the landscape scale. Also, hedgerows may benefit

502 more to some bat species depending on their structure (strata), plant diversity and even  
503 height. Lacoeyuilhe et al. (2018), showed that bat species preferred wooded hedgerows  
504 dominating in agricultural landscapes rather than a diversity of hedgerow types. Hawking  
505 bat species such as *Pipistrellus* spp., benefit from wooded hedgerows due to their  
506 vegetation that shelters a large number of insects and allows dispersal away from the  
507 wind (Lewis & Dibley, 1970). Moreover, gleaning foragers, which are mainly species from  
508 SRE guild, were associated with more complex hedgerows with diversified strata. These  
509 results also point out that the quality of the hedgerow itself might be critical to explain its  
510 differentiated use by the different bat species (Froidevaux et al., 2019; Wickramasinghe  
511 et al., 2003).

512 Our study is therefore in line with several others that highlight both the benefits of the  
513 compositional heterogeneity of the crop mosaic but also its arrangement with other semi-  
514 natural and woodland habitats resulting in promoting bat diversity and activity (Fill et al.,  
515 2022; Maas et al., 2016; Monck-Whipp et al., 2018; Pedro et al., 2021; Puig-Montserrat  
516 et al., 2015; Rodríguez-San Pedro et al., 2019).

517

#### 518 ***4.2. Crops benefit from each other within the landscape in terms of biological*** 519 ***control of pests***

520 Our study adds to the growing body of literature supporting the positive effects of diverse  
521 agricultural landscapes and woodlands on biocontrol agents such as bats resulting in  
522 higher pest regulation activity (Fill et al., 2022; Maas et al., 2016). We tried to find out the  
523 reciprocal benefits of different crop types already implanted in the region and all around  
524 the world. It appeared that crop association at the landscape scale offered benefits for  
525 each crop in terms of biological control of pests. In our study, grapevines and pine  
526 plantations indicate higher levels of biological control by bats in diverse landscapes than  
527 in landscapes dominated by a single crop. In vineyards, the abundance of moths

528 decreased with the bat species richness. This represents an indicator of potential  
529 biological control, but the low moth population levels and the lack of damage  
530 measurements does not allow to affirm that this process is actually at play. However, in  
531 French vineyards, Charbonnier et al. (2021) highlighted the regulation role of bats on  
532 grape berry moths. Also the importance of adjacent forested semi-natural habitats near  
533 vineyards for prey availability was assessed in Central Chile vineyards which suggests  
534 that both semi-natural and vineyards may promote bat conservation and resources  
535 (Chaperon et al., 2022). In pine plantations, in July, foraging activity (particularly MRE  
536 activity) was not correlated with the relative abundance of *T. pityocampa* but significantly  
537 and negatively with the index of damage on pine trees. These results partly corroborate  
538 those from previous studies showing that different species belonging to the three guilds  
539 are *T. pityocampa* predators without being independent on it in their diet (Garin et al.,  
540 2019) and that bats were efficient biological pest control agents for *T. pityocampa*. Bat  
541 foraging plasticity allowing them to concentrate their activity on local prey aggregates  
542 (Charbonnier et al., 2014), and the high mobility of pine processionary moths through the  
543 landscape may explain the non-detection of a relationship between bat activity and  
544 relative abundance of *T. pityocampa* (Battisti et al., 2015).

545 However, no difference of potential moth biological control was observed in maize  
546 between maize-dominated and diverse landscapes: while the abundance of moths seems  
547 to attract bats (in particular reflected by SRE and LRE foraging activities), the associated  
548 predator-prey dynamics does not allow for biological control. It is probably related to the  
549 rapid oviposition rate observed in *S. nonagrioides*, with a maximum of egg-laying on  
550 maize as soon as 30% of the moths have emerged. Although the role of bats as predators  
551 of corn pests has been demonstrated (Maine & Boyles, 2015; Whitby et al., 2020) bats  
552 probably predate moths after most of the eggs have already been laid on maize plants.  
553 While biological control of *S. nonagrioides* in maize does not seem to be directly and

554 solely controlled by bats, other natural enemies, such as parasitoids, can be involved in  
555 the egg stages of this pest and be favoured by diverse landscapes (Gardiner et al., 2009;  
556 Landis & Haas, 1992). Additional agricultural practices, not recorded in our study, such  
557 as the use of pesticides, may also vary between fields and dampen relationships between  
558 moth abundances and observed damage (Paredes et al., 2021). Nevertheless, maize  
559 appears to provide moth prey that benefit bats at the landscape level, possibly translating  
560 into a higher biological pest control by the same bats in the other adjacent crop types.  
561 Our study illustrates that the diversification of agricultural landscapes to favour biological  
562 control can be thought of by taking advantage of the dominant crops in the landscapes,  
563 as an alternative to the introduction of new crop species, then without fundamentally  
564 modifying the local value chains (Vialatte et al., 2021). Our study is in line with the results  
565 of recent meta-analyses that show that crop diversification promotes biodiversity,  
566 biological control and yields (Beillouin et al., 2021; Paiola et al., 2020; Tamburini et al.,  
567 2020). It complements this work, which is largely dominated by intra-plot diversification  
568 by showing that crop diversification at the landscape scale is also a lever for biological  
569 control. While semi-natural elements in landscapes are widely known to support  
570 biodiversity and biological control (Dainese et al., 2019; Karp et al., 2018) and in particular  
571 by bats (Chaperon et al., 2022; Pedro et al., 2021) crop mosaics appear to be a  
572 complementary way of diversification. In the face of the risk of pest outbreaks associated  
573 with global warming (Klapwijk et al., 2012), our results open up avenues of alternative  
574 agroecological management to conventional agriculture for globally important crops such  
575 as maize (world's second cereal, FAOSTAT, 2020), planted forests (conifers account for  
576 more than 55% of the world's forest plantation resource) and grapevines (Brockerhoff et  
577 al., 2017; Hannah et al., 2013).

578

### 579 **4.3. Conservation implications**

580 It is widely recognised that habitat loss driven by the expansion of agriculture has led to  
581 biodiversity declines (e.g. Billeter et al., 2008). One of the main challenges for biodiversity  
582 conservation is therefore to maintain or enhance biodiversity by taking advantage of  
583 existing production types by increasing the diversity of crops, as well as their spatial and  
584 temporal arrangement at the scale of the wider landscape mosaic. This study highlights  
585 that considering crop diversity and more precisely annual and perennial crops with  
586 different ecological characteristics favourable for bats could represent an efficient  
587 conservation strategy to promote bat species richness, and favour species of major  
588 conservation concern in agricultural landscapes. Bat responses to landscape features  
589 vary depending on their home range size, species-specific echolocation call  
590 characteristics and foraging strategies that may explain the diversity of species identified  
591 and the role of agricultural landscapes as foraging and commuting areas (Frey-Ehrenbold  
592 et al., 2013; Laforge et al., 2021).

593 Finally, the activity of species of conservation concern was significantly and positively  
594 related to the most diverse agricultural landscapes. We suggest that the diverse  
595 landscapes mixing crops and forests studied here actually have a high conservation  
596 potential due to their higher structural complexity (Harvey & González Villalobos, 2007;  
597 Schroth, 2004) allowing a differentiated use by a large range of bat guilds. Moreover,  
598 improving landscape compositional heterogeneity through an increase of the amount of  
599 key habitats such as hedgerows or riparian zones, their spatial configuration and their  
600 connectivity are of main importance (e.g. Froidevaux, Boughey, et al., 2017; Froidevaux,  
601 Louboutin, et al., 2017; Fuentes- Montemayor et al., 2011; Heim et al., 2015; Monck-  
602 Whipp et al., 2018).

603 Mata et al. (2021) showed that a limited number of bat species, consisting of both  
604 common species such as *P. pipistrellus* and conservation concern species, are central in



605 pest interaction networks and could be the focus of conservation strategies. The results  
606 of our study support that enhancing crop diversity by combining agricultural fields and  
607 forestry and also other landscape elements such as linear features promote  
608 complementary and more stable resources (e.g. roost, foraging, commuting), which will  
609 benefit to a large range of bat species with some positive effects on biological control in  
610 crop fields.

611 **5. Conclusion**

612 Because of their ability to disperse and as generalist predators, bats have been proved  
613 to be particularly important in controlling pest outbreaks (Boyles et al., 2013). While more  
614 and more studies are focusing on the diet of bats via metabarcoding methods, few studies  
615 have been carried out to assess the role of bats for pest control (Russo et al., 2018), and  
616 even fewer have considered the agricultural and forestry mosaic. Our study adds to the  
617 growing body of literature by (i) showing the positive effects of more diverse agricultural  
618 landscapes on bat richness and activity and (ii) supporting the efficacy of bats for the  
619 biological control of crop and forest pests (Charbonnier et al., 2014; Maine & Boyles,  
620 2015). Agricultural landscapes combining a diverse crop mosaic (in a broad sense,  
621 including pine forestry) provide more stable resources over space and time for generalist  
622 predators such as bats. Thus, more diverse landscapes can allow for win-win strategies  
623 in each of the sampled crop increasing bat activity and biological pest control. In addition,  
624 more diverse landscapes benefit to a large range of bat species from different guilds,  
625 which may have a complementary predation on pests (Garin et al., 2019). These results  
626 may benefit greatly to biocontrol conservation, especially in the context of diversifying  
627 agricultural landscapes facing rapid global changes.

628

629 **Acknowledgements**

630 This study was funded half by INRAE through the Sustainable Management of Crop  
631 Health metaprogram and the Occitanie Region.

632 We thank CC-IN2P3 and PCIA-MNHN for providing computing and storage facilities,  
633 Yves and Didier Bas for their help in this process.

634 We thank Philippe Mouquot of the Gironde Chamber of Agriculture for his expertise on  
635 maize fields. We are very grateful to Benjamin Joubard, Olivier Bonnard, Jérôme Molina  
636 and Jérôme Willm (INRAE) for their help in collecting data, to François Chiron (CNRS)  
637 for the loan of equipment and Yohan Charbonnier (LPO) for his bat expertise. We thank  
638 Adrien Rusch and Bastien Castagneyrol for their scientific advices in the sampling design.

639 We would like to thank all the land-owners who graciously allowed us to work in their  
640 fields.

641

642 **References**

- 643 Aizpurua, O., Budinski, I., Georgiakakis, P., Gopalakrishnan, S., Ibañez, C., Mata, V.,  
644 Rebelo, H., Russo, D., Szodoray-Parádi, F., Zhelyazkova, V., Zrncic, V., Gilbert,  
645 M. T. P., & Alberdi, A. (2018). Agriculture shapes the trophic niche of a bat preying  
646 on multiple pest arthropods across Europe: Evidence from DNA metabarcoding.  
647 *Molecular Ecology*, 27(3), 815–825. <https://doi.org/10.1111/mec.14474>
- 648 Allegrini, C., Korine, C., & Krasnov, B. R. (2022). Insectivorous bats in eastern  
649 mediterranean planted pine forests-effects of forest structure on foraging activity,  
650 diversity, and implications for management practices. *Forests*, 13(9), 1411.  
651 <https://doi.org/10.3390/f13091411>
- 652 Ancillotto, L., Rummo, R., Agostinetto, G., Tommasi, N., Garonna, A. P., de Benedetta,  
653 F., Bernardo, U., Galimberti, A., & Russo, D. (2022). Bats as suppressors of  
654 agroforestry pests in beech forests. *Forest Ecology and Management*, 522,  
655 120467. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2022.120467>
- 656 Arthur, L., & Lemaire, M. (2015). *Les chauves-souris de France, Belgique, Luxembourg*  
657 *et Suisse*. Biotope.
- 658 Azam, C., Le Viol, I., Julien, J.-F., Bas, Y., & Kerbiriou, C. (2016). Disentangling the  
659 relative effect of light pollution, impervious surfaces and intensive agriculture on  
660 bat activity with a national-scale monitoring program. *Landscape Ecology*, 31(10),  
661 2471–2483. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10980-016-0417-3>
- 662 Barbaro, L., Rusch, A., Muiruri, E. W., Gravellier, B., Thiery, D., & Castagneyrol, B.  
663 (2017). Avian pest control in vineyards is driven by interactions between bird  
664 functional diversity and landscape heterogeneity. *Journal of Applied Ecology*,  
665 54(2), 500–508. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2664.12740>
- 666 Barré, K., Viol, I. L., Julliard, R., Pauwels, J., Newson, S. E., Julien, J.-F., Claireau, F.,  
667 Kerbiriou, C., & Bas, Y. (2019). Accounting for automated identification errors in

668 acoustic surveys. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, 10(8), 1171–1188.  
669 <https://doi.org/10.1111/2041-210X.13198>

670 Bas, Y., Bas, D., & Julien, J.-F. (2017). Tadarida: A toolbox for animal detection on  
671 acoustic recordings. *Journal of Open Research Software*, 5(1), Article 1.  
672 <https://doi.org/10.5334/jors.154>

673 Battisti, A., Avci, M., Avtzis, D. N., Jamaa, M. L. B., Berardi, L., Berretima, W., Branco,  
674 M., Chakali, G., El Alaoui El Fels, M. A., Frérot, B., Hódar, J. A., Ionescu-Mălăncuș,  
675 I., İpekdal, K., Larsson, S., Manole, T., Mendel, Z., Meurisse, N., Mirchev, P.,  
676 Nemer, N., ... Zamoum, M. (2015). Natural history of the processionary moths  
677 (*thaumetopoea* spp.): New insights in relation to climate change. In A. Roques  
678 (Ed.), *Processionary Moths and Climate Change: An Update* (pp. 15–79). Springer  
679 Netherlands. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-017-9340-7\\_2](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-017-9340-7_2)

680 Beillouin, D., Ben-Ari, T., Malézieux, E., Seufert, V., & Makowski, D. (2021). Positive but  
681 variable effects of crop diversification on biodiversity and ecosystem services.  
682 *Global Change Biology*, 27(19), 4697–4710. <https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.15747>

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

686 Bertrand, C., Burel, F., & Baudry, J. (2016). Spatial and temporal heterogeneity of the  
687 crop mosaic influences carabid beetles in agricultural landscapes. *Landscape*  
688 *Ecology*, 31(2), 451–466. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10980-015-0259-4>

689 Billeter, R., Liira, J., Bailey, D., Bugter, R., Arens, P., Augenstein, I., Aviron, S., Baudry,  
690 J., Bukacek, R., Burel, F., Cerny, M., De Blust, G., De Cock, R., Diekötter, T., Dietz,  
691 H., Dirksen, J., Dormann, C., Durka, W., Frenzel, M., ... Edwards, P. j. (2008).  
692 Indicators for biodiversity in agricultural landscapes: A pan-European study.

- 693 *Journal of Applied Ecology*, 45(1), 141–150. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365->  
694 2664.2007.01393.x
- 695 Blažek, J., Konečný, A., & Bartonička, T. (2021). Bat aggregational response to pest  
696 caterpillar emergence. *Scientific Reports*, 11(1), 13634.  
697 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-021-93104-z>
- 698 Boyles, J. G., Cryan, P. M., McCracken, G. F., & Kunz, T. H. (2011). Economic  
699 Importance of Bats in Agriculture. *Science*, 332(6025), 41–42.  
700 <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1201366>
- 701 Boyles, J. G., Sole, C. L., Cryan, P. M., & McCracken, G. F. (2013). On estimating the  
702 economic value of insectivorous bats: Prospects and priorities for biologists. In R.  
703 A. Adams & S. C. Pedersen (Eds.), *Bat Evolution, Ecology, and Conservation* (pp.  
704 501–515). Springer New York. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4614-7397-8\\_24](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4614-7397-8_24)
- 705 Brockerhoff, E. G., Barbaro, L., Castagneyrol, B., Forrester, D. I., Gardiner, B., González-  
706 Olabarria, J. R., Lyver, P. O., Meurisse, N., Oxbrough, A., Taki, H., Thompson, I.  
707 D., van der Plas, F., & Jactel, H. (2017). Forest biodiversity, ecosystem functioning  
708 and the provision of ecosystem services. *Biodiversity and Conservation*, 26(13),  
709 3005–3035. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10531-017-1453-2>
- 710 Bruun, M., & Smith, H. G. (2003). Landscape composition affects habitat use and foraging  
711 flight distances in breeding European starlings. *Biological Conservation*, 114(2),  
712 179–187. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0006-3207\(03\)00021-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0006-3207(03)00021-1)
- 713 Cadotte, M. W., Carscadden, K., & Mirotnick, N. (2011). Beyond species: Functional  
714 diversity and the maintenance of ecological processes and services. *Journal of*  
715 *Applied Ecology*, 48(5), 1079–1087. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365->  
716 2664.2011.02048.x
- 717 Chaperon, P. N., Rodríguez-San Pedro, A., Beltrán, C. A., Allendes, J. L., Barahona-  
718 Segovia, R. M., Urra, F., & Grez, A. A. (2022). Effects of adjacent habitat on

719 nocturnal flying insects in vineyards and implications for bat foraging. *Agriculture,*  
720 *Ecosystems & Environment*, 326, 107780.  
721 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2021.107780>

722 Charbonnier, Y., Barbaro, L., Theillout, A., & Jactel, H. (2014). Numerical and Functional  
723 Responses of Forest Bats to a Major Insect Pest in Pine Plantations. *PLOS ONE*,  
724 9(10), e109488. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0109488>

725 Charbonnier, Y., Papura, D., Touzot, O., Rhouy, N., Sentenac, G., & Rusch, A. (2021).  
726 Pest control services provided by bats in vineyard landscapes. *Agriculture,*  
727 *Ecosystems & Environment*, 306, 107207.  
728 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2020.107207>

729 Dainese, M., Martin, E. A., Aizen, M. A., Albrecht, M., Bartomeus, I., Bommarco, R.,  
730 Carvalheiro, L. G., Chaplin-Kramer, R., Gagic, V., Garibaldi, L. A., Ghazoul, J.,  
731 Grab, H., Jonsson, M., Karp, D. S., Kennedy, C. M., Kleijn, D., Kremen, C., Landis,  
732 D. A., Letourneau, D. K., ... Steffan-Dewenter, I. (2019). A global synthesis reveals  
733 biodiversity-mediated benefits for crop production. *Science Advances*, 1–14.

734 Delbac, L., & Thiéry, D. (2016). Damage to grape flowers and berries by *L obesia botrana*  
735 larvae (Denis & Schiffenüller) (Lepidoptera: Tortricidae), and relation to larval age:  
736 Larval age and damages by *Lobesia botrana*. *Australian Journal of Grape and*  
737 *Wine Research*, 22(2), 256–261. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ajgw.12204>

738 Duflot, R., San-Cristobal, M., Andrieu, E., Choisis, J.-P., Esquerré, D., Ladet, S., Ouin,  
739 A., Rivers-Moore, J., Sheeren, D., Sirami, C., Fauvel, M., & Vialatte, A. (2022).  
740 Farming intensity indirectly reduces crop yield through negative effects on  
741 agrobiodiversity and key ecological functions. *Agriculture, Ecosystems &*  
742 *Environment*, 326, 107810. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2021.107810>

743 Etienne, R. S., Haegeman, B., Dugo-Cota, Á., Vilà, C., Gonzalez-Voyer, A., & Valente, L.  
744 (2022). *The limits to ecological limits to diversification* [Preprint]. *Evolutionary*  
745 *Biology*. <https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.05.13.491338>

746 Fahrig, L., Girard, J., Duro, D., Pasher, J., Smith, A., Javorek, S., King, D., Lindsay, K. F.,  
747 Mitchell, S., & Tischendorf, L. (2015). Farmlands with smaller crop fields have  
748 higher within-field biodiversity. *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment*, *200*, 219–  
749 234. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2014.11.018>

750 FAOSTAT (2020). Retrieved 14 September 2022, from  
751 <https://www.fao.org/faostat/fr/#data/QCL/metadata>

752 Fill, C., Allen, C., Twidwell, D., & Benson, J. (2022). Spatial distribution of bat activity in  
753 agricultural fields: Implications for ecosystem service estimates. *Ecology and*  
754 *Society*, *27*(2). <https://doi.org/10.5751/ES-13170-270211>

755 Flynn, D. F. B., Gogol-Prokurat, M., Nogeire, T., Molinari, N., Richers, B. T., Lin, B. B.,  
756 Simpson, N., Mayfield, M. M., & DeClerck, F. (2009). Loss of functional diversity  
757 under land use intensification across multiple taxa. *Ecology Letters*, *12*(1), 22–33.  
758 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1461-0248.2008.01255.x>

759 Frey-Ehrenbold, A., Bontadina, F., Arlettaz, R., & Obrist, M. K. (2013). Landscape  
760 connectivity, habitat structure and activity of bat guilds in farmland-dominated  
761 matrices. *Journal of Applied Ecology*, *50*(1), 252–261.  
762 <https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2664.12034>

763 Froidevaux, J. S. P., Boughey, K. L., Barlow, K. E., & Jones, G. (2017). Factors driving  
764 population recovery of the greater horseshoe bat (*Rhinolophus ferrumequinum*) in  
765 the UK: Implications for conservation. *Biodiversity and Conservation*, *26*(7), 1601–  
766 1621. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10531-017-1320-1>

767 Froidevaux, J. S. P., Boughey, K. L., Hawkins, C. L., Broyles, M., & Jones, G. (2019).  
768 Managing hedgerows for nocturnal wildlife: Do bats and their insect prey benefit



769 from targeted agri-environment schemes? *Journal of Applied Ecology*, 56(7),  
770 1610–1623. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2664.13412>

771 Froidevaux, J. S. P., Louboutin, B., & Jones, G. (2017). Does organic farming enhance  
772 biodiversity in Mediterranean vineyards? A case study with bats and arachnids.  
773 *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment*, 249, 112–122.  
774 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2017.08.012>

775 Fuentes-Montemayor, E., Goulson, D., & Park, K. J. (2011). The effectiveness of agri-  
776 environment schemes for the conservation of farmland moths: Assessing the  
777 importance of a landscape-scale management approach. *Journal of Applied*  
778 *Ecology*, 48(3), 532–542. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2664.2010.01927.x>

779 Gardiner, M. M., Landis, D. A., Gratton, C., DiFonzo, C. D., O’Neal, M., Chacon, J. M.,  
780 Wayo, M. T., Schmidt, N. P., Mueller, E. E., & Heimpel, G. E. (2009). Landscape  
781 diversity enhances biological control of an introduced crop pest in the north-central  
782 USA. *Ecological Applications*, 19(1), 143–154. <https://doi.org/10.1890/07-1265.1>

783 Garin, I., Aihartza, J., Goiti, U., Arrizabalaga-Escudero, A., Nogueras, J., & Ibáñez, C.  
784 (2019). Bats from different foraging guilds prey upon the pine processionary moth.  
785 *PeerJ*, 7, e7169. <https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.7169>

786 Geiger, F., Bengtsson, J., Berendse, F., Weisser, W. W., Emmerson, M., Morales, M. B.,  
787 Ceryngier, P., Liira, J., Tschamntke, T., Winqvist, C., Eggers, S., Bommarco, R.,  
788 Pärt, T., Bretagnolle, V., Plantegenest, M., Clement, L. W., Dennis, C., Palmer, C.,  
789 Oñate, J. J., ... Inchausti, P. (2010). Persistent negative effects of pesticides on  
790 biodiversity and biological control potential on European farmland. *Basic and*  
791 *Applied Ecology*, 11(2), 97–105. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.baae.2009.12.001>

792 Hannah, L., Roehrdanz, P. R., Ikegami, M., Shepard, A. V., Shaw, M. R., Tabor, G., Zhi,  
793 L., Marquet, P. A., & Hijmans, R. J. (2013). Climate change, wine, and

794 conservation. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 110(17), 6907–  
795 6912. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1210127110>

796 Harvey, C. A., & González Villalobos, J. A. (2007). Agroforestry systems conserve  
797 species-rich but modified assemblages of tropical birds and bats. *Biodiversity and*  
798 *Conservation*, 16(8), 2257–2292. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10531-007-9194-2>

799 Heim, O., Treitler, J. T., Tschapka, M., Knörnschild, M., & Jung, K. (2015). The  
800 Importance of Landscape Elements for Bat Activity and Species Richness in  
801 Agricultural Areas. *PLOS ONE*, 10(7), e0134443.  
802 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0134443>

803 Inglada, J., Vincent, A., Arias, M., Tardy, B., Morin, D., & Rodes, I. (2017). Operational  
804 High Resolution Land Cover Map Production at the Country Scale Using Satellite  
805 Image Time Series. *Remote Sensing*, 9(1), Article 1.  
806 <https://doi.org/10.3390/rs9010095>

807 Jacquet, J.-S., Orazio, C., & Jactel, H. (2012). Defoliation by processionary moth  
808 significantly reduces tree growth: A quantitative review. *Annals of Forest Science*,  
809 69(8), 857–866. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13595-012-0209-0>

810 Karp, D. S., Chaplin-Kramer, R., Meehan, T. D., Martin, E. A., DeClerck, F., Grab, H.,  
811 Gratton, C., Hunt, L., Larsen, A. E., Martínez-Salinas, A., O'Rourke, M. E., Rusch,  
812 A., Poveda, K., Jonsson, M., Rosenheim, J. A., Schellhorn, N. A., Tscharrntke, T.,  
813 Wratten, S. D., Zhang, W., ... Zou, Y. (2018). Crop pests and predators exhibit  
814 inconsistent responses to surrounding landscape composition. *Proceedings of the*  
815 *National Academy of Sciences*, 115(33), E7863–E7870.  
816 <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1800042115>

817 Kerbiriou, C., Bas, Y., Le Viol, I., Lorrilliere, R., Mougnot, J., & Julien, J. F. (2019).  
818 Potential of bat pass duration measures for studies of bat activity. *Bioacoustics*,  
819 28(2), 177–192. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09524622.2017.1423517>

820 Klapwijk, M. J., Ayres, M. P., Battisti, A., & Larsson, S. (2012). Assessing the impact of  
821 climate change on outbreak potential. In *Insect Outbreaks Revisited* (pp. 429–  
822 450). John Wiley & Sons, Ltd. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118295205.ch20>

823 Krings, C. H., Darras, K., Hass, A., Batáry, P., & Fabian, Y. (2022). Not only hedgerows,  
824 but also flower fields can enhance bat activity in intensively used agricultural  
825 landscapes. *Basic and Applied Ecology*, *63*, 23–35.  
826 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.baae.2022.05.002>

827 La Liste rouge des Chiroptères d'Aquitaine. Observatoire Aquitain de la Faune Sauvage.  
828 Talence, OAFS (coord) 2019.12 p.

829 Lacoeuilhe, A., Machon, N., Julien, J.-F., & Kerbiriou, C. (2018). The relative effects of  
830 local and landscape characteristics of hedgerows on bats. *Diversity*, *10*(3), 72.  
831 <https://doi.org/10.3390/d10030072>

832 Laforge, A., Archaux, F., Coulon, A., Sirami, C., Froidevaux, J., Gouix, N., Ladet, S.,  
833 Martin, H., Barré, K., Roemer, C., Claireau, F., Kerbiriou, C., & Barbaro, L. (2021).  
834 Landscape composition and life-history traits influence bat movement and space  
835 use: Analysis of 30 years of published telemetry data. *Global Ecology and*  
836 *Biogeography*, *30*(12), 2442–2454. <https://doi.org/10.1111/geb.13397>

837 Landis, D. A., & Haas, M. J. (1992). Influence of landscape structure on abundance and  
838 within-field distribution of european corn borer (Lepidoptera: Pyralidae) larval  
839 parasitoids in michigan. *Environmental Entomology*, *21*(2), 409–416.  
840 <https://doi.org/10.1093/ee/21.2.409>

841 Letourneau, D. K., Jedlicka, J. A., Bothwell, S. G., & Moreno, C. R. (2009). Effects of  
842 natural enemy biodiversity on the suppression of arthropod herbivores in terrestrial  
843 ecosystems. *Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics*, *40*(1), 573–  
844 592. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.ecolsys.110308.120320>

845 Lewis, T., & Dibley, G. C. (1970). Air movement near windbreaks and a hypothesis of the  
846 mechanism of the accumulation of airborne insects. *Annals of Applied Biology*,  
847 66(3), 477–484. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-7348.1970.tb04627.x>

848 Maas, B., Karp, D. S., Bumrungsri, S., Darras, K., Gonthier, D., Huang, J. C.-C., Lindell,  
849 C. A., Maine, J. J., Mestre, L., Michel, N. L., Morrison, E. B., Perfecto, I., Philpott,  
850 S. M., Şekercioğlu, Ç. H., Silva, R. M., Taylor, P. J., Tschardtke, T., Bael, S. A. V.,  
851 Whelan, C. J., & Williams-Guillén, K. (2016). Bird and bat predation services in  
852 tropical forests and agroforestry landscapes. *Biological Reviews*, 91(4), 1081–  
853 1101. <https://doi.org/10.1111/brv.12211>

854 Maine, J. J., & Boyles, J. G. (2015). Bats initiate vital agroecological interactions in corn.  
855 *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 112(40), 12438–12443.  
856 <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1505413112>

857 Martin, E. A., Reineking, B., Seo, B., & Steffan-Dewenter, I. (2013). Natural enemy  
858 interactions constrain pest control in complex agricultural landscapes.  
859 *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 110(14), 5534–5539.  
860 <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1215725110>

861 Mata, V. A., da Silva, L. P., Veríssimo, J., Horta, P., Raposeira, H., McCracken, G. F.,  
862 Rebelo, H., & Beja, P. (2021). Combining DNA metabarcoding and ecological  
863 networks to inform conservation biocontrol by small vertebrate predators.  
864 *Ecological Applications*, 31(8), e02457. <https://doi.org/10.1002/eap.2457>

865 McCracken, G. F., Westbrook, J. K., Brown, V. A., Eldridge, M., Federico, P., & Kunz, T.  
866 H. (2012). Bats Track and Exploit Changes in Insect Pest Populations. *PLOS ONE*,  
867 7(8), e43839. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0043839>

868 Millon, L., Julien, J.-F., Julliard, R., & Kerbiriou, C. (2015). Bat activity in intensively  
869 farmed landscapes with wind turbines and offset measures. *Ecological*  
870 *Engineering*, 75, 250–257. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecoleng.2014.11.050>

- 871 Monck-Whipp, L., Martin, A. E., Francis, C. M., & Fahrig, L. (2018). Farmland  
872 heterogeneity benefits bats in agricultural landscapes. *Agriculture, Ecosystems &*  
873 *Environment*, 253, 131–139. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2017.11.001>
- 874 Muneret, L., Auriol, A., Thiéry, D., & Rusch, A. (2019). Organic farming at local and  
875 landscape scales fosters biological pest control in vineyards. *Ecological*  
876 *Applications*, 29(1). <https://doi.org/10.1002/eap.1818>
- 877 Ocampo-Ariza, C., Maas, B., Castro-Namuche, J. P., Thomas, E., Vansynghel, J.,  
878 Steffan-Dewenter, I., & Tschardtke, T. (2022). Trait-dependent responses of birds  
879 and bats to season and dry forest distance in tropical agroforestry. *Agriculture,*  
880 *Ecosystems & Environment*, 325, 107751.  
881 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2021.107751>
- 882 O'Donnell, C. F. J. (2002). Influence of Sex and Reproductive Status on Nocturnal Activity  
883 of Long-Tailed Bats (*Chalinolobus tuberculatus*). *Journal of Mammalogy*, 83(3),  
884 794–803.
- 885 Oerke, E.-C. (2006). Crop losses to pests. *The Journal of Agricultural Science*, 144(1),  
886 31–43. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0021859605005708>
- 887 Paiola, A., Assandri, G., Brambilla, M., Zottini, M., Pedrini, P., & Nascimbene, J. (2020).  
888 Exploring the potential of vineyards for biodiversity conservation and delivery of  
889 biodiversity-mediated ecosystem services: A global-scale systematic review.  
890 *Science of The Total Environment*, 706, 135839.  
891 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2019.135839>
- 892 Paredes, D., Rosenheim, J. A., Chaplin-Kramer, R., Winter, S., & Karp, D. S. (2021).  
893 Landscape simplification increases vineyard pest outbreaks and insecticide use.  
894 *Ecology Letters*, 24(1), 73–83. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ele.13622>
- 895 Parsons, K. (2007). *Bat Surveys: Good practice guidelines*. Bat Conservation Trust.

- 896 Pedro, A. R.-S., Ávila, F., Chaperon, P. N., Beltrán, C. A., Allendes, J. L., & Grez, A. A.  
897 (2021). The role of the adjacent habitat on promoting bat activity in vineyards: A  
898 case study from central Chile. *Acta Chiropterologica*, 23(1).  
899 <https://doi.org/10.3161/15081109ACC2021.23.1.014>
- 900 Puig-Montserrat, X., Torre, I., López-Baucells, A., Guerrieri, E., Monti, M. M., Ràfols-  
901 García, R., Ferrer, X., Gisbert, D., & Flaquer, C. (2015). Pest control service  
902 provided by bats in Mediterranean rice paddies: Linking agroecosystems structure  
903 to ecological functions. *Mammalian Biology*, 80(3), 237–245.  
904 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mambio.2015.03.008>
- 905 Rainho, A., & Palmeirim, J. M. (2011). The Importance of Distance to Resources in the  
906 Spatial Modelling of Bat Foraging Habitat. *PLOS ONE*, 6(4), e19227.  
907 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0019227>
- 908 Rand, T. A., Waters, D. K., Blodgett, S. L., Knodel, J. J., & Harris, M. O. (2014). Increased  
909 area of a highly suitable host crop increases herbivore pressure in intensified  
910 agricultural landscapes. *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment*, 186, 135–143.  
911 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2014.01.022>
- 912 Ricci, B., Lavigne, C., Alignier, A., Aviron, S., Biju-Duval, L., Bouvier, J. C., Choisis, J.-P.,  
913 Franck, P., Joannon, A., Ladet, S., Mezerette, F., Plantegenest, M., Savary, G.,  
914 Thomas, C., Vialatte, A., & Petit, S. (2019). Local pesticide use intensity conditions  
915 landscape effects on biological pest control. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B:*  
916 *Biological Sciences*, 286(1904), 20182898.  
917 <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2018.2898>
- 918 Rodríguez-San Pedro, A., Rodríguez-Herbach, C., Allendes, J. L., Chaperon, P. N.,  
919 Beltrán, C. A., & Grez, A. A. (2019). Responses of aerial insectivorous bats to  
920 landscape composition and heterogeneity in organic vineyards. *Agriculture,*

921           *Ecosystems*           &           *Environment*,           277,           74–82.  
922           <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2019.03.009>

923   Rusch, A., Chaplin-Kramer, R., Gardiner, M. M., Hawro, V., Holland, J., Landis, D., Thies,  
924           C., Tschardtke, T., Weisser, W. W., Winqvist, C., Woltz, M., & Bommarco, R.  
925           (2016). Agricultural landscape simplification reduces natural pest control: A  
926           quantitative synthesis. *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment*, 221, 198–204.  
927           <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2016.01.039>

928   Russo, D., Bosso, L., & Ancillotto, L. (2018). Novel perspectives on bat insectivory  
929           highlight the value of this ecosystem service in farmland: Research frontiers and  
930           management implications. *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment*, 266, 31–38.  
931           <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2018.07.024>

932   Rydell, J., Entwistle, A., & Racey, P. A. (1996). Timing of foraging flights of three species  
933           of bats in relation to insect activity and predation risk. *Oikos*, 76(2), 243–252.  
934           <https://doi.org/10.2307/3546196>

935   Salvarina, I. (2016). Bats and aquatic habitats: A review of habitat use and anthropogenic  
936           impacts. *Mammal Review*, 46(2), 131–143. <https://doi.org/10.1111/mam.12059>

937   Salvarina, I., Gravier, D., & Rothhaupt, K. (2018). Seasonal bat activity related to insect  
938           emergence at three temperate lakes. *Ecology and Evolution*, 8(7), 3738–3750.  
939           <https://doi.org/10.1002/ece3.3943>

940   Schellhorn, N. A., Gagic, V., & Bommarco, R. (2015). Time will tell: Resource continuity  
941           bolsters ecosystem services. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, 30(9), 524–530.  
942           <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2015.06.007>

943   Schnitzler, H.-U., & Kalko, E. K. V. (2001). Echolocation by insect-eating bats.  
944           *BioScience*, 51(7), 557.           <https://doi.org/10.1641/0006->  
945           3568(2001)051[0557:EBIEB]2.0.CO;2

- 946 Schroth, G. (Ed.). (2004). *Agroforestry and biodiversity conservation in tropical*  
947 *landscapes*. Island Press.
- 948 Simler-Williamson, A. B., Rizzo, D. M., & Cobb, R. C. (2019). Interacting Effects of Global  
949 Change on Forest Pest and Pathogen Dynamics. *Annual Review of Ecology,*  
950 *Evolution, and Systematics*, 50(1), 381–403. [https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-](https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-ecolsys-110218-024934)  
951 [ecolsys-110218-024934](https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-ecolsys-110218-024934)
- 952 Sirami, C., Gross, N., Baillod, A. B., Bertrand, C., Carrié, R., Hass, A., Henckel, L., Miguet,  
953 P., Vuillot, C., Alignier, A., Girard, J., Batáry, P., Clough, Y., Violle, C., Giralt, D.,  
954 Bota, G., Badenhausser, I., Lefebvre, G., Gauffre, B., ... Fahrig, L. (2019).  
955 Increasing crop heterogeneity enhances multitrophic diversity across agricultural  
956 regions. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 116(33), 16442–  
957 16447. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1906419116>
- 958 Sirami, C., Jacobs, D. S., & Cumming, G. S. (2013). Artificial wetlands and surrounding  
959 habitats provide important foraging habitat for bats in agricultural landscapes in  
960 the Western Cape, South Africa. *Biological Conservation*, 164, 30–38.  
961 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2013.04.017>
- 962 Tamburini, G., Bommarco, R., Wanger, T. C., Kremen, C., van der Heijden, M. G. A.,  
963 Liebman, M., & Hallin, S. (2020). Agricultural diversification promotes multiple  
964 ecosystem services without compromising yield. *Science Advances*, 6(45),  
965 eaba1715. <https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.aba1715>
- 966 Thiéry, D., Louâpre, P., Muneret, L., Rusch, A., Sentenac, G., Vogelweith, F., Iltis, C., &  
967 Moreau, J. (2018). Biological protection against grape berry moths. A review.  
968 *Agronomy for Sustainable Development*, 38(2), 15.  
969 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13593-018-0493-7>



970 Tilman, D., Balzer, C., Hill, J., & Befort, B. L. (2011). Global food demand and the  
971 sustainable intensification of agriculture. *Proceedings of the National Academy of*  
972 *Sciences*, 108(50), 20260–20264. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1116437108>

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

977 Tscharntke, T., Tylianakis, J. M., Rand, T. A., Didham, R. K., Fahrig, L., Batáry, P.,  
978 Bengtsson, J., Clough, Y., Crist, T. O., Dormann, C. F., Ewers, R. M., Fründ, J.,  
979 Holt, R. D., Holzschuh, A., Klein, A. M., Kleijn, D., Kremen, C., Landis, D. A.,  
980 Laurance, W., ... Westphal, C. (2012). Landscape moderation of biodiversity  
981 patterns and processes—Eight hypotheses. *Biological Reviews*, 87(3), 661–685.  
982 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-185X.2011.00216.x>

983 Veres, A., Petit, S., Conord, C., & Lavigne, C. (2013). Does landscape composition affect  
984 pest abundance and their control by natural enemies? A review. *Agriculture,*  
985 *Ecosystems & Environment*, 166, 110–117.  
986 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2011.05.027>

987 Vialatte, A., Tibi, A., Alignier, A., Angeon, V., Bedoussac, L., Bohan, D. A., Bougherara,  
988 D., Carpentier, A., Castagneyrol, B., Cordeau, S., Courtois, P., Deguine, J.-P.,  
989 Enjalbert, J., Fabre, F., Féménia, F., Fréville, H., Goulet, F., Gâteau, R.,  
990 Grimonprez, B., ... Martinet, V. (2021). Promoting crop pest control by plant  
991 diversification in agricultural landscapes: A conceptual framework for analysing  
992 feedback loops between agro-ecological and socio-economic effects. In *Advances*  
993 *in Ecological Research*. Academic Press.  
994 <https://doi.org/10.1016/bs.aecr.2021.10.004>

- 995 Whitby, M. D., Kieran, T. J., Glenn, T. C., & Allen, C. (2020). Agricultural pests consumed  
996 by common bat species in the United States corn belt: The importance of DNA  
997 primer choice. *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment*, 303, 107105.  
998 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2020.107105>
- 999 Wickramasinghe, L. P., Harris, S., Jones, G., & Vaughan, N. (2003). Bat activity and  
1000 species richness on organic and conventional farms: Impact of agricultural  
1001 intensification. *Journal of Applied Ecology*, 40(6), 984–993.  
1002 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2664.2003.00856.x>
- 1003 Zuur, A. F., Ieno, E. N., Walker, N., Saveliev, A. A., & Smith, G. M. (2009). *Mixed effects*  
1004 *models and extensions in ecology with R*. Springer New York.  
1005 <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-87458-6>  
1006