

1 For Journal of Pest Science (Original paper)

2 **Efficacy of entomopathogenic nematodes for control of large pine weevil, *Hylobius***
3 ***abietis*: effects of soil type, pest density and spatial distribution.**

4
5 Apostolos Kapranas^{1*}, Ben Malone¹, Sarajane Quinn¹, Louise Mc Namara¹, Christopher D.
6 Williams², Pdraig O'Tuama³, Arne Peters⁴ & Christine T. Griffin¹

7
8 ¹Department of Biology, Maynooth University, Maynooth, Co. Kildare, Ireland

9 ²School of Natural Sciences and Psychology, Liverpool John Moores University,
10 Liverpool L3 3AF, UK

11 ³Coillte Forest, Hartnetts Cross, Macroom, Co. Cork, Ireland

12 ⁴E-nema GmbH, Klausdorfer Str. 28-36, D-24223 Schwentinental, Germany

13
14 Running title: *Biological control of large pine weevil with entomopathogenic nematodes*

15
16 *Corresponding author current address: Institute of Biology, University of Neuchâtel,
17 Neuchâtel, 2000 Switzerland +41 327183135, apostolos.kapranas@unine.ch

18
19 **Author Contribution Statement:** AK CTG and POT conceived and designed research. AK
20 BM SQ LM CDW conducted experiments. AP provided the entomopathogenic nematodes.
21 AK and CTG analyzed data and wrote the manuscript. All authors read and approved the
22 manuscript.

23 **Acknowledgements:** We thank Abigail Maher for technical support, and numerous forest
24 managers and technicians from Coillte Ireland for providing access to sites and helping with
25 trials. This research was funded by the BIOCOTES project co-funded by EU FP7.

26 **Key Message:**

- 27 • Entomopathogenic nematodes (EPN) were applied to conifer stumps for control of the
28 large pine weevil *Hylobius abietis* LPW.
- 29 • Species with different foraging strategies (ambushers vs cruisers) provided the same
30 level of control.
- 31 • EPN efficacy is predicted to be increased in organic soils. However, EPN efficacy in
32 suppressing LPW populations in peaty (organic rich) and in mineral soils was equal.
- 33 • Weevil density and spatial distribution within stumps, which both vary depending on
34 soil type, explain how EPN parasitize and suppress the pests.

35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 **Abstract**

50 The large pine weevil *Hylobius abietis* (L.), LPW, is a major pest of trees in replanted
51 coniferous forests in northern Europe. The use of entomopathogenic nematodes (EPN)
52 applied against developing stages for population suppression is increasingly recognised as an
53 effective alternative to plant protection using chemical pesticides. Here we report results from
54 a series of trials we conducted over two years using two species of EPN, *Steinernema*
55 *carpocapsae* (Weiser) and *Heterorhabditis downesi* (Stock, Griffin, and Burnell) with different
56 foraging strategies. Trials were conducted at lodgepole pine sites in Ireland on both mineral
57 and peat soil type. EPN suspension was applied to the stumps of felled pine trees and EPN
58 efficacy was determined afterwards by directly assessing parasitism rates after debarking one
59 quarter of the stumps and by collecting emerging adult weevils from traps erected over other
60 treated and control stumps. Our results suggest that both species of EPN are equally effective
61 in suppressing LPW populations to below the current, informal thresholds of economic
62 damage. EPN were equally efficient in controlling LPW in peat and in mineral
63 (lithosols/regosols and acid brown earth/brown pozolics) soils. Weevil density and
64 distribution within pine stumps in peat vs. mineral sites can explain patterns of LPW
65 parasitism and suppression. Our results also suggest that infestation level (number of weevils
66 per stump) can be an important factor in forecasting EPN application success.

67

68 **Keywords:** forest pest, root feeding insect, entomopathogenic nematodes, foraging strategy,
69 soil type, density-dependent parasitism.

70 **Introduction**

71 The large pine weevil *Hylobius abietis* (L.) (Coleoptera: Curculionidae) is the most important
72 pest of tree seedlings in replanted coniferous forests in Northern Europe, costing an estimated
73 €140 million in Europe of which €2.75 million in the UK alone (Evans et al. 2015). The
74 weevils are attracted to clear-felled areas by volatile chemicals emitted by the stumps of
75 recently felled trees; they oviposit in the stumps and immature weevils develop under the
76 bark (Leather et al. 1999). Upon emergence, in late summer to autumn, adult weevils feed on
77 young seedlings and can destroy 100% of newly planted trees with an estimated mortality in
78 UK and Ireland of 50% within the first few years in sites untreated with insecticides
79 (Heritage & Moore 2001). A single adult can damage or kill several young plants (Eidmann
80 and Lindelöw 1997; Wainhouse et al. 2007), and thus even a low number of adults emerging
81 from stumps can have a significant impact on sites that have been replanted. In recent years
82 concerns over weevil damage have increased due to climate change and rising temperatures
83 which not only leads to a shorter life cycle and increased flight and dispersal of the LPW
84 (Inward et al. 2012; Tan et al. 2010), but also shifts in the distribution of areas suitable for the
85 large pine weevil (Barredo et al. 2015).

86 Current practices for managing LPW rely on a variety of chemical, cultural and
87 biological methods. Treatment of the young plants prior to planting with pyrethroids and an
88 additional top-up spray of planted trees is the most popular method, but cypermethrin and
89 alpha-cypermethrin, the most effective pesticides, are only available for use in UK and
90 Ireland for a limited period under derogation from the Forest Stewardship Council
91 (Anonymous 2014). In addition, concerns over environmental impacts lead to withdrawal of
92 many synthetic pesticides based on EU directives (Directive 91/414/EEC, Regulation
93 1107/2009/EC). Before pesticides are used, biological control measures, together with
94 physical and other non-chemical methods, should have first preference (Directive

95 2009/128/EC). Delay of restocking sites for at least two years has been reported to be helpful
96 if there are no clear-felled areas nearby (Örlander and Nilsson 1999; Örlander and
97 Nordlander 2003; Leather et al. 1999). Management of felling and restocking dates using
98 decision support systems integrated with GIS to minimize weevil impacts has become
99 standard practice in UK (Wainhouse et al. 2007; Evans et al. 2004). Entomopathogenic
100 nematodes (EPN) applied in an inundative fashion are a promising tool in the management of
101 the pine weevil (Torr et al. 2005; Brixey et al. 2006; Dillon et al. 2006, 2007, 2008; Williams
102 et al. 2013a). In addition they are environmentally safe (Ehlers and Hokkanen 1996) and have
103 little impact on non-target species in the pine weevil habitat (Dillon et al. 2012).

104 Previous trials in Ireland have shown that the most promising species is the native
105 *Heterorhabditis downesi*, a cruise-foraging nematode (Dillon et al. 2006; Williams et al.
106 2013a). However, these studies also highlighted that *Steinernema carpocapsae* (Weiser), an
107 ambush-type forager, can also be quite effective against LPW, contrary to the assumption that
108 EPNs with an ambush foraging strategy are not efficient in controlling subterranean pests
109 (Gaugler et al. 1997; Grewal et al. 2005). The former species occurs naturally in Ireland,
110 Britain and in continental Europe (Stock et al. 2002) but it is still not commercially produced,
111 whereas the latter is cultured by many commercial producers of biological control agents and
112 thus it is readily available for use in management of LPW. Furthermore, a meta-analysis
113 study has shown that the efficacy of EPN against LPW is predicted to be greater in peat soils
114 which are characterised by a high level of organic matter than in mineral soils which have
115 lower organic matter (Williams et al. 2013b).

116 As part of the BIOCOMES (2013-2017) consortium which promotes the development
117 and use of biopesticides, our purpose in these studies was to directly compare the two species
118 *H. downesi* and *S. carpocapsae* which seem to show the most promising results against LPW.
119 In contrast to previous trials (Dillon et al. 2006; Williams et al. 2013b), where *H. downesi*

120 was produced in wax moth larvae, in the present study both nematode species were produced
121 in bioreactors under commercial conditions (Friedman 1990). Moreover, we explicitly tested
122 the conclusion of the meta-analysis that peat soils favour nematode control of LPW by
123 including both peaty and mineral soils in each of two trial years. We conducted all our trials
124 in pine sites (*Pinus* spp.), as weevils develop in higher numbers than in spruce (*Picea* spp.)
125 (von Sydow and Birgersson 1997; Dillon et al. 2008; Williams et al. 2013b). A direct
126 relationship between number of weevils developing in stumps and subsequent damage by
127 adults on replanted seedlings has not yet been demonstrated; however, current experience and
128 practice in both Ireland and UK (Wainhouse et al. 2007; unpublished note Coillte, Ireland)
129 show that 20 weevils/stump will result in emergence of adult weevils at levels requiring plant
130 protection. Previous studies have compared nematode efficacy in relation to control stumps
131 but in this set of trials we also directly compare numbers of adult weevils emerging from
132 stumps with the target threshold which should be more informative for foresters and pest
133 management decision makers. Lastly we investigate how weevil infestation and spatial
134 distribution within stumps influences EPN parasitism and consequently efficacy in
135 controlling LPW.

136

137 **Materials and methods**

138 *Sites of field studies*

139 Trials were conducted on three field sites in 2014 and on four field sites in 2015 which are
140 summarized in Table 1. All sites were clear-felled lodgepole pine *Pinus contorta* Dougl. var.
141 *latifolia*. Sites were categorized as peat and as mineral (*ca.* 5-10 cm of organic litter layer
142 overlying mineral soil). Mineral soils were further classified to the respective great soil group
143 by reference to the interactive soil maps of the National Biodiversity Data Centre
144 (<http://maps.biodiversityireland.ie/>). At each site, treatments were arranged in a randomized

145 block design with each block bearing a control stump, a stump treated with *S. carpocapsae*
146 and a stump treated with *H. downesi*. For each treatment there were 20 blocks; 10 of these
147 blocks were selected for assessment of parasitism rates (destructive sampling of 30 stumps)
148 and the other 10 were used for monitoring emergence of weevils (placement of traps over 30
149 stumps). Stumps were approximately of equal size across all treatments and sites. Application
150 of nematodes took place at the time that weevils were in late larval and/or pupal stage, which
151 was confirmed by destructively sampling a number of stumps one to two weeks before the
152 application.

153 *Application of entomopathogenic nematodes*

154 *S. carpocapsae* (EN03) and *H. downesi* (K122) used for the trials were provided by e-nema
155 GmbH. Packages with EPN infective juveniles (IJs) were stored for less than a week at 9°C
156 until the day of application. On the day of application aqueous suspensions were prepared
157 and kept in 5 L bottles with aquarium pumps for aeration until they were transferred to the
158 field. At the field, 500 ml of the suspension ($\sim 3.5 \times 10^6$ IJs) was applied around the base of
159 each stump (Torr et al. 2005). In control stumps there was no treatment (application of only
160 water as control does not have any effect based on earlier studies).

161 *Assessment of efficacy*

162 Efficacy of treatments was assessed by destructive sampling (hacking) four weeks after
163 application of EPNs and by trapping adult weevils emerging from stumps, following
164 established methods (e.g., Dillon et al. 2006, 2007, 2008). Destructive sampling was
165 performed by removing the bark of about one quarter of the stump with a chisel to a depth of
166 at least 40 cm under the soil surface by clearing away the soil from the stump and associated
167 roots, and recording the stage (larva, pupa, adult), status (healthy, parasitized by nematode,
168 parasitized by fungi, dead by undetermined reason) and location (depth relative to soil level
169 and distance from bole) of each individual pine weevil. Weevils were removed with clean

170 forceps, placed in 24-well plates and transferred to the laboratory. They were then incubated
171 at ~20°C for another two weeks to check for post-sampling EPN mortality.

172 Modified emergence traps (Moore 2001) were erected about two weeks after EPN
173 application and were then sampled every 2-4 weeks throughout the season, starting mid July
174 until weevil emergence ceased in November. For the control stumps, we also compared
175 directly the weevil number (all stages) observed during hacking (multiplied by four) with the
176 ones collected in the traps. However, a limited number of control stumps were hacked in
177 2015 due to the limited time window to complete the volume of work (Table 2).

178 *Statistical analysis*

179 Comparison of 'in-root' weevil distribution - depth under soil surface and distance from bole-
180 between mineral and deep peat sites was achieved with a non-parametric Kolmogorov-
181 Smirnov test. Standard *t*-tests were used to compare weevil catches in traps and weevils
182 found during hacking for control stumps in order to assess weevil emergence, and also to
183 compare in-root depth and distance of weevils between peat and mineral sites. Analysis of
184 factors influencing immature weevil parasitism rates and adult weevil emergence was
185 performed with Generalized Linear Models (GLMs) (Crawley 2007). We assumed quasi-
186 binomial error variance for parasitism (proportional) data and significance of effects was
187 assessed by the change in deviance when a variable was removed from the full model. We
188 also used a mixed effect logistic regression analysis to explore parasitism rates in relation to
189 depth below soil surface and horizontal distance from the bole of the stump. Nematode
190 species (two level factor), weevil number, site, depth and distance were introduced as fixed
191 effects whereas each stump was introduced in the analysis as a random effect. We present the
192 raw means of proportional data because they are biologically more relevant than transformed
193 data along with asymmetrical standard errors. (All analyses were performed using GENSTAT
194 statistical package (Version 14, VSN International, Hemel Hempstead, U.K.).

195 For emergence data (cumulative trap collections over the season) which followed a
196 normal distribution based on Anderson-darling test, we used a two way-ANOVA with
197 nematode species and site introduced as factors; the controls from this analysis were excluded
198 as the purpose was to compare the two EPN species at different locations. Analysis was
199 performed separately for each year. In addition we performed one way ANOVAs followed by
200 a Kramer–Tukey test, to detect differences among means across all site and treatment
201 combinations, with the controls included. Within locations we compared different treatments
202 with a Fisher's least significant difference (LSD) procedure which is a more liberal post-hoc
203 test, while preserving the experiment wise type I error rate at the nominal level of
204 significance, if the number of treatment groups is three (Meier 2006). A complementary one-
205 tailed *t*-test comparing trap catches with a mean of 20 which is the number of weevils per
206 stump that are indicated as a threshold for chemical treatment as recommended by Coillte
207 (Ireland's national forestry company), was also performed.

208 **Results**

209 *Population structure and distribution of weevils in stumps.*

210 Based on hacking control stumps four weeks post application, weevils seemed to be earlier in
211 their development in 2015 than 2014 (Table 2). Weevil distribution in stump roots was
212 different between peat and mineral sites (Figure 2, Smirnov-Kolmogorov test for comparing
213 distributions between two samples, depth: $D = 0.064$, $P < 0.001$; distance: $D = 0.099$, $P <$
214 0.05). The average depth of weevils was greater in peat vs. mineral sites (14.89 ± 0.236 cm vs
215 12.51 ± 0.387 cm; $t_{2690} = 4.904$, $P < 0.001$). Similarly the average distance of weevils from
216 bole was greater in peat vs. mineral sites (13.57 ± 0.351 cm vs 11.23 ± 0.561 cm; $t_{2690} = 3.264$, P
217 $= 0.001$). Thus, weevils were more likely to be found in the roots deepest and farthest from
218 the bole in stumps on peat than in stumps on mineral soils (Fig. 1). The site in Clonohil

219 (peat) had a much higher percentage of weevils at depths > 20cm compared to the other sites
220 – 55% versus 9-31% for the other six sites (Table 2).

221 There was also a positive relationship between the number of weevils per stump and their
222 average distance from the bole of the stump (GLM model with weevils: $F_{1,115} = 22.46$, $P <$
223 0.001 ; soil type: $F_{1,115} = 3.83$, $P = 0.053$) but there was not a significant relationship between
224 weevil number and average depth (GLM model with weevils: $F_{1,115} = 0.13$, $P = 0.720$; soil
225 type: $F_{1,115} = 3.83$, $P = 0.053$).

226 *Parasitism rates: differences among sites and nematode species*

227 Parasitism rates (after a two week post sampling incubation period) were the same for both
228 nematode species in both years (GLM analysis, 2014: $F_{1,56} = 2.18$, $P = 0.116$; 2015; $F_{1,68} =$
229 0.61 , $P = 0.437$, Fig. 2). Parasitism rates did not differ across the three sites in 2014 ($F_{2,56} =$
230 2.27 , $P = 0.114$), but they were significantly different across sites in 2015 ($F_{3,68} = 14.37$, $P <$
231 0.001). However, no clear trend existed in comparing parasitism rates between peat and
232 mineral sites (Fig. 3). The interactions between site and nematode species were insignificant
233 for both years and are not shown.

234 *Effects of pine weevil infestation on parasitism rates*

235 For the year 2014 we found no effects of weevil number per stump on parasitism rates ($F_{1,56} =$
236 0.3 , $P = 0.584$), but in 2015 parasitism rates were inversely correlated with weevil number
237 per stump ($F_{1,68} = 6.48$, $P = 0.014$, Fig. 3). Despite a strong negative trend, the effect of
238 number of weevils on parasitism rates was not significant when data from both years were
239 combined ($F_{1,125} = 3.27$, $P = 0.074$) but was significant when instead of site, soil type (peat vs
240 mineral) was introduced in the model ($F_{1,125} = 12.83$, $P < 0.001$).

241 *Parasitism rates in relation to root depth and distance from the stump*

242 Logistic analysis showed that LPW parasitism rates were significantly lower at greater depths
243 in soil ($F_{1,2684} = 70.85$, $P < 0.001$, Fig. 4a) and at greater distance from the bole of the stumps

244 ($F_{1,2684} = 239.76$, $P < 0.001$, Fig. 4b). Parasitism rates in relation to depth and distance did not
245 differ between the two nematode species ($F_{1,2684} = 0.13$, $P = 0.719$), but they did differ
246 significantly among sites ($F_{6,2684} = 68.1$, $P < 0.001$, Fig.4). Furthermore, the interactions
247 between site, depth and distance were also significant (site*depth: $F_{6,2684} = 2.54$, $P = 0.019$,
248 site*distance: $F_{6,2684} = 5.00$, $P < 0.001$). However, trends of parasitism rates in relation to
249 depth and distance among sites of different soil type (peat versus mineral) were not clear;
250 Parasitism rates of LPW at deeper levels seemed to be greater for two of the three mineral
251 sites (Killurney and Tigroney, Fig. 4a), at both of which the soil was classified as
252 lithosol/regosol (Table 1). Parasitism at greater distance from the bole was greater at a peat
253 site (Knockaville, Fig. 4b)

254 *Emergence of pine weevils*

255 Numbers of adult LPW emerging from stumps treated with *H. downesi* or with *S.*
256 *carpocapsae* did not differ in either year (Table 3, Fig. 5 & 6). Numbers of emerging adult
257 LPW from stumps treated with both species also did not differ amongst the three sites in
258 2014, but they significantly differed amongst sites in 2015, due to the high infestation in the
259 Clonoghil site (Table 2, Fig. 5 & 6).

260 In 2014 the number of LPW emerging from stumps treated with *H. downesi* was significantly
261 lower compared with the controls across all three sites, whereas *S. carpocapsae* was
262 effective in two sites (both of peat) (Fig. 5). In 2015, applications of both nematode species
263 led to significant suppression of LPW adult emergence in three out of four sites (Fig. 6). The
264 site at which application did not lead to significant suppression was a peat site (Clonoghil).

265 In one site (Gurtnapisha, mineral) the average adult weevil number/ control stump was lower
266 than the suggested threshold of 20 weevils/ stump and from a management perspective there
267 was no need for treating this site (Fig. 6). However, the higher number of weevils in control
268 stumps at destructive sampling than the number of adult weevils collected in traps indicates

269 that weevil emergence during the late summer-autumn was incomplete (Table 2). In the
270 remaining six sites, treatment with EPN led to suppression of weevil emergence below the
271 suggested threshold of 20 weevils/stump in five out of six sites, but for each location one
272 species only provided the level of control sought; however, there was no relationship between
273 soil type and which species was most effective (Figures 5 & 6).

274 *Assessment of weevil emergence*

275 In three sites (one in 2014 and two in 2015) weevil emergence was determined to be
276 incomplete based on comparisons between weevils found in stumps during hacking and adult
277 weevils collected in traps, in control stumps. Two of these sites were mineral (Killurney 2014
278 and Gurtnapisha 2015, Table 2).

279 **Discussion**

280 Our study confirms previous studies showing that the use of EPN can be efficient in
281 controlling LPW (Dillon et al. 2006, 2007). However, it adds new information that is highly
282 pertinent to controlling LPW by application of EPN and also suggests that the importance of
283 factors such as soil type and infestation load (i.e., number of weevils developing in the stump,
284 Williams et al. 2013b) should be at least considered in the future. Differences in parasitism
285 rates were strikingly different among the two years of our trials. Ambient and soil
286 temperatures were higher in 2014 than in 2015 especially in June and July, the months
287 immediately following application (supplementary material). In addition to the direct effect
288 of temperature on nematode efficacy (Grewal et al. 1994; Wilson et al. 2016), the higher
289 temperatures of 2014 may have influenced nematode efficacy indirectly through an effect on
290 weevil development. In 2014 weevils were more advanced in their development at the time
291 of application. While LPW pupae are in general less susceptible to EPN than are larvae, there
292 is evidence that both newly pupated insects and callow adults are susceptible (Williams et al.

293 2015). Application at a time when many of weevils are transitioning from larva to pupa or
294 from pupa to callow adult may favour EPN.

295 Overall, our trials suggest that both *H. downesi* and *S. carpocapsae* are equally
296 efficient in parasitizing the LPW developing in stumps and subsequently suppressing adult
297 numbers coming out of the stumps as shown by our emergence trap data. This is perhaps not
298 surprising; although previous studies showed that *H. downesi* is superior to *S. carpocapsae*, it
299 was suggested that the latter should not be underrated as a biological control agent (Dillon et
300 al. 2006, 2007). In our trials, *S. carpocapsae* not only provided considerable suppression
301 relative to controls in many cases, but also suppressed the numbers of emerging adult weevils
302 below the targeted threshold of 20/stump, as many times as *H. downesi* did. It is also
303 noteworthy that in the current study parasitism rates in relation to depth and distance from the
304 base of the stump were equal for both species. These results are also intriguing given the
305 ambushing foraging behaviour of this species; because *S. carpocapsae* can find and infect
306 relatively immobile insects at considerable distances even deep within soil, the current
307 classification of EPN based on their foraging behaviour (ambushers vs cruisers) is under
308 question (Wilson et al. 2012; Griffin 2015). On the other hand, it might be possible that
309 nematodes are carried passively along the roots either by the suspension water or later
310 through rainfall which was adequate in summer of both years (supplementary material).
311 Other studies have similarly confirmed the effectiveness of *S. carpocapsae* in parasitizing
312 and controlling other root feeding insects (Jansson et al. 1993; de Altube et al. 2008). The *H.*
313 *downesi* used in the present experiments was the same strain as used in our previous trials,
314 but was produced in bioreactors, formulated and shipped from Germany to Ireland, instead of
315 being produced in the laboratory in wax moth larvae as previously (Dillon et al. 2006, 2007,
316 2008; Williams et al. 2013a). Production methods may impact on quality of EPN (Grewal and
317 Peters 2005), but there was no evidence that bioreactor-produced *H. downesi* were of lower

318 quality than the insect-produced nematodes used in previous trials (see analysis in
319 supplementary material).

320 Many studies have addressed the effects of soil texture on EPN efficacy, with the
321 emphasis on the mineral component of the soil (e.g. Choo and Kaya, 1991; Koppenhöfer and
322 Fuzy 2006), but much of the coniferous forestry in northern temperate regions is planted in
323 peat soils. For example, 45% of Irish forests have a peat depth of over 30 cm (Anonymous,
324 2007). Peat soils are characterised by very high organic matter, derived from the
325 accumulation of dead plant material under water-logged, anaerobic conditions. Several recent
326 studies suggest that media with high organic content including peat are favourable for EPN
327 (Kruitbos et al. 2010; Ansari and Butt 2011; Nielsen and Lewis 2011; Wilson et al. 2012).
328 Our results show that both EPN species were as efficacious in peat as in soils classified as
329 mineral. The suitability of this medium for nematodes may be in part due to the high moisture
330 content of peaty soils (Paavilainen and Päivänen 1995; Grant and Villani 2003; Preisser and
331 Strong 2004), movement of nematodes through rootways that might be more accessible in
332 peaty soils (Ennis et al. 2010), and carriage of cues needed for host location at longer
333 distances (Hitpold and Turlings 2008; Turlings et al. 2012). Our trials do not support the
334 previous meta-analysis of studies on using EPN for controlling the LPW suggesting that
335 efficacy was greater in peat than in mineral soils (Williams et al. 2013b). “Mineral” is a broad
336 category, encompassing many different sub-types used for forestry, ranging from acid brown
337 earths (well drained productive soils with good physical properties) to gleys (poorly drained
338 soils with poor soil physical properties (Kennedy 2002). In addition, peat soils also vary
339 based on formation type and subsequent peat extraction practices (Renou and Farrell 2005).
340 For example, deeper layers of cutover blanket bog have poor hydraulic conductivity (hence
341 poor drainage) (Renou and Farrell 2005). Thus, a more refined soil classification would aid in
342 predicting EPN efficacy against LPW. Nonetheless, our study suggests at least that the use of

343 EPN for controlling LPW should not only be determined by soil type, but other factors might
344 also be important (see below).

345 Our trials also provide some evidence that level of infestation can have important
346 effects on LPW parasitism rates. This can be further confirmed by looking at weevil trap
347 catches; the only site on which EPN did not provide any significant suppression over the
348 control stumps, nor achieved the target number of 20 weevils/stump, was the site with the
349 highest weevil infestation (Clonoghil, adult weevils emerging max = 468, median = 102, fig.
350 5). Mechanistically, density dependence can be explained by the reduced capacity of
351 nematodes to reach weevils which are located in deeper roots and horizontally farthest from
352 the bole. In stumps bearing a high numbers of weevils, more of the weevils are located at
353 more distant parts of the roots and thus a higher percentage of weevils escape parasitism by
354 nematodes. Density dependent parasitism can explain patterns of weevil suppression
355 observed in our trials, and also bears important consequences for the use of EPN as
356 biocontrol agents for LPW. For instance, more inoculum might be needed in cases of high
357 infestations (Shapiro-Ilan et al. 2012). However, it should be noted that in our trials the EPN
358 dose applied as determined by other studies (Torr et al. 2005; Dillon et al. 2006, 2007)
359 provided satisfactory control in moderate to high infestation levels, except in one case where
360 infestation levels were so high; in this case the efficacy of any other alternative control
361 measure is questionable.

362 Passive movement of EPN either by suspension or by later rainfall might be more
363 favoured in peaty soils (Wheeler 1995) but average weevil depth in mineral sites tends to be
364 lower than in deep peat sites. This trend was even more extreme in Clonoghil, a peat site
365 where a relatively small fraction of weevils were found closer to the surface in comparison
366 with other sites of either soil type. In addition, when infestations are high, weevils are found
367 further from the bole, both for mineral and peat sites. More distantly located weevils along

368 the roots are parasitized at lower rates as we demonstrate here and in other studies (Dillon et
369 al. 2006, 2007). These properties of weevil distribution in stumps could explain the relatively
370 equal efficacy of EPN in mineral and peat soils. In other words, EPN movement and survival
371 might be more constrained in mineral sites, but in these sites target weevils are closer to the
372 application point making it easier to be reached by EPN. Moreover, if LPW infestations in
373 peat sites are moderately high then it is likely that EPN will provide at least an adequate to
374 good level of control. In our study we also observed that weevils are more abundant in peat
375 sites than in mineral ones. Thus EPN efficacy in mineral sites can at least be explained by
376 lower weevil infestation rates.

377 Lastly, we should point out that our trials were in pine stumps which sustain a higher
378 number of weevils than in spruce stumps (von Sydow and Birgersson 1997; Dillon et al.
379 2008; Williams et al. 2013b), and thus the use of EPN in spruce sites might provide even
380 better control of LPW. Other topics of investigation would be on optimizing application
381 method of the suspension (e.g. Brixey et al. 2006) and also assessing how soil compaction
382 due to timber harvesting machinery can influence EPN efficacy. In conclusion the results of
383 our trials not only confirm previous studies suggesting that EPN are efficient inundative
384 biological control agents of LPW, but also show that two species with different foraging
385 strategies are equally efficient in suppressing LPW populations at the target level sought. In
386 addition, EPN application should not only be determined by soil type but also on other factors
387 such as infestation levels, which is even more encouraging in widening their use in more
388 cases where LPW control is sought.

389 **This article does not contain any studies with animals performed by any of the authors.**

390 **References**

- 391 1. Anonymous (2007) National Forest Inventory Republic of Ireland Results. Forest
392 Service, Johnstown Castle, Wexford, Ireland.
- 393 2. Anonymous (2014) FSC Pesticide Derogation Approval: Use of alpha-Cypermethrin in
394 UK. FSC-DER-30-V2-0 EN alpha-cypermethrin UK 150614. Forest Stewardship
395 Council.
- 396 3. Ansari MA, Butt TM (2011) Effect of potting media on the efficacy and dispersal of
397 entomopathogenic nematodes for the control of black vine weevil, *Otiorhynchus sulcatus*
398 (Coleoptera: Curculionidae). *Biol Control* 58: 310–318.
- 399 4. Barredo JI, Strona G, de Rigo D, Caudullo G, Stancanelli G, San-Miguel-Ayanz J (2015)
400 Assessing the potential distribution of insect pests: case studies on large pine weevil
401 (*Hylobius abietis* L.) and horse-chestnut leaf miner (*Cameraria ohridella*) under present
402 and future climate conditions in European forests. *Bull EPPO*. 45: 273–281. doi:
403 10.1111/epp.12208
- 404 5. BIOCOMES consortium, <http://www.biocomes.eu/>
- 405 6. Brixey JM, Moore R, Milner AD (2006) Effect of entomopathogenic nematode
406 (*Steinernema carpocapsae* Weiser) application technique on the efficacy and distribution
407 of infection of the large pine weevil (*Hylobius abietis* L.) in stumps of Sitka spruce
408 (*Picea sitchensis* Carr.) created at different times. *Forest Ecol Manag* 226: 161–172
- 409 7. Choo HY, Kaya HK (1991) Influence of soil texture and presence of roots on host
410 finding by *Heterorhabditis bacteriophora*. *J Invertebr Pathol* 58: 279–280
- 411 8. Crawley MJ (1997) *GLIM for Ecologists*. Blackwell Science, Oxford.
- 412 9. De Altube MDMM., Strauch O, De Castro GF, Pena AM. (2008) Control of the flat-
413 headed root borer *Capnodis tenebrionis* (Linne) (Coleoptera: Buprestidae) with the
414 entomopathogenic nematode *Steinernema carpocapsae* (Weiser) (Nematoda:
415 Steinernematidae) in a chitosan formulation in apricot orchards. *BioControl* 53: 531–539

- 416 10. Dillon AB, Ward D, Downes MJ, Griffin CT (2006) Suppression of the large pine weevil
417 *Hylobius abietis* (L.) (Coleoptera: Curculionidae) in pine stumps by entomopathogenic
418 nematodes with different foraging strategies. Biol Control 38: 217–226
- 419 11. Dillon AB, Downes MJ, Ward D, Griffin CT (2007) Optimizing application of
420 entomopathogenic nematodes to manage large pine weevil, *Hylobius abietis* L.
421 (Coleoptera: Curculionidae) populations developing in pine stumps, *Pinus sylvestris*.
422 Biol Control 40: 253–263
- 423 12. Dillon AB, Moore CP, Downes MJ, Griffin CT (2008) Evict or Infect? Managing
424 populations of the large pine weevil, *Hylobius abietis*, using a bottom-up and top-down
425 approach. Forest Ecol Manag 255: 2634-2642
- 426 13. Dillon AB, Foster A, Williams CD, Griffin CT (2012) Environmental safety of
427 entomopathogenic nematodes – effects on abundance, diversity and community structure
428 of non-target beetles in a forest ecosystem. Biol Control 63: 107–114
- 429 14. EC (1991) Council Directive 91/414/EEC concerning the placing of plant protection
430 products on the market. Off J Eur Union 230:1–32
- 431 15. EC (2009) Council Directive 2009/128/EC establishing a framework for Community
432 action to achieve the sustainable use of pesticides. Off J Eur Union 309: 71–86
- 433 16. EC (2009) Directive Regulation 1107/2009/EC concerning the placing of plant
434 protection products on the market and repealing Council Directives 79/117/EEC and
435 91/414/EEC. Off J Eur Union 309: 1–50
- 436 17. Ehlers R-U, Hokkanen HMT (1996) Insect biocontrol with non-endemic
437 entomopathogenic nematodes (*Steinernema* and *Heterorhabditis* spp.): Conclusions and
438 recommendations of a combined OECD and COST Workshop on Scientific and
439 Regulatory Policy Issues. Biocontrol Sci Techn 6: 295–302

- 440 18. Eidmann HH, Lindelow A (1997) Estimates and measurements of pine weevil feeding on
441 conifer seedlings: their relationships and application. *Can J Forest Res* 27: 1068–1073
- 442 19. Ennis DE, Dillon AB, Griffin C.T (2010) Simulated roots and host feeding enhance
443 infection of subterranean insects by the entomopathogenic nematode *Steinernema*
444 *carpocapsae*. *J Invertebr Pathol* 103: 140–143
- 445 20. Evans H, McAllister F, Saunders T, Moore R, Jenkins T, Butt T, Ansari M., Griffin C,
446 Williams C, Teck, R, Sweeney J (2015) The Impact project guide to *hyalobius*
447 management 2015. Taliesin Communications
- 448 21. Evans H, Moore R, Heritage S, Wainhouse D (2004) Developments in the integrated
449 management of pine weevil, a pest of restocking in conifer plantations. Forerest Research
450 Annual Reports and Accounts 2003–2004. Edinburgh, UK
- 451 22. Friedman MJ (1990) Commercial production and development. In: R Gaugler, HK Kaya
452 (Eds) *Entomopathogenic nematodes in biological control*, CRC Press, Boca Raton. pp.
453 153–172
- 454 23. Gaugler R, Lewis E, Stuart RJ (1997) Ecology in the service of biological control: the
455 case of entomopathogenic nematodes. *Oecologia* 109: 483–489
- 456 24. Grewal PS, Selvan S, Gaugler R (1994) Thermal adaptation of entomopathogenic
457 nematodes: niche breadth for infection, establishment, and reproduction. *J Therm Biol*
458 19: 245–253
- 459 25. Grewal PS, Ehlers R-U, Shapiro-Ilan D. (2005) *Nematodes as Biocontrol Agents*. CABI,
460 Wallingford, UK.
- 461 26. Grewal PS, Peters A (2005) Formulation and quality. In: PS Grewal, R-U Ehlers,
462 Shapiro-Ilan D (Eds) *Nematodes as Biocontrol Agents*, CABI, Wallingford, UK, pp. 79–
463 90

- 464 27. Grant JA, Villani MG (2003) Soil moisture effects on entomopathogenic nematodes. J
465 Nematol 15: 329–332
- 466 28. Griffin, CT (2015) Behaviour and population dynamics of entomopathogenic nematodes
467 following application. In: Campos-Herrera R (ed.) Nematode pathogenesis of insects and
468 other pests - ecology and applied technologies for sustainable plant and crop protection,
469 Springer International Publishing, pp 57-96
- 470 29. Heritage S, Moore R (2001) The assessment of site characteristics as part of a
471 management strategy to reduce damage by *Hylobius*. Forestry Commission Information
472 Note 38, HMSO, UK.
- 473 30. Hiltbold I, Turlings TCJ (2008) Belowground chemical signaling in maize: when
474 simplicity rhymes with efficiency. J Chem Ecol 34: 628–35
- 475 31. Inward DJG, Wainhouse D, Peace A (2012) The effect of temperature on the
476 development and life cycle regulation of the pine weevil *Hylobius abietis* and the
477 potential impacts of climate change. Agric For Entomol 14: 348–357
- 478 32. Jansson RK, Lecrone SH, Gaugler R (1993) Field efficacy and persistence of
479 entomopathogenic nematodes (Rhabditida, Steinernematidae, Heterorhabditidae) for
480 control of sweet-potato weevil (Coleoptera, Apionidae) in southern Florida. J Econ
481 Entomol 86: 1055–1063
- 482 33. Kennedy F (2002) The identification of soils for forest management. Forestry
483 Commission field guide 19. Forestry Commission, Edinburgh, Scotland.
- 484 34. Koppenhöfer AM, Fuzy EMJ (2006) Effect of soil type on infectivity and persistence of
485 the entomopathogenic nematodes *Steinernema scarabaei*, *Steinernema glaseri*,
486 *Heterorhabditis zealandica*, and *Heterorhabditis bacteriophora*. J Invertebr Pathol 92:
487 11–22

- 488 35. Kruitbos LM, Heritage S, Hapca S, Wilson MJ (2010) The influence of habitat quality on
489 the foraging strategies of the entomopathogenic nematodes *Steinernema carpocapsae*
490 and *Heterorhabditis megidis*. *Parasitology* 137: 303–309
- 491 36. Leather SR, Day KR, Salisbury AN (1999) The biology and ecology of the large pine
492 weevil, *Hylobius abietis* (Coleoptera: Curculionidae): a problem of dispersal? *Bull*
493 *Entomol Res* 89: 3–16
- 494 37. Meier U (2006) A note on the power of Fisher's least significant difference procedure.
495 *Pharmaceut Statist* 5: 253–263
- 496 38. Moore R. (2001) Emergence trap developed to capture adult large pine weevil *Hylobius*
497 *abietis* (Coleoptera: Curculionidae) and its parasite *Bracon hylobii* (Hymenoptera:
498 Braconidae). *Bull Entomol Res* 91: 109–115
- 499 39. Nielsen A , Lewis EE (2011) Designing the ideal habitat for entomopathogen use in
500 nursery production. *Pest Manag Sci* 68: 1053–1061
- 501 40. Örlander GR, Nilsson U (1999) Effect of reforestation methods on pine weevil (*Hylobius*
502 *abietis*) damage and seedling survival. *Scand. J. For. Res.* 14: 341–354
- 503 41. Örlander GR, Nordlander GR (2003) Effects of field vegetation control on pine weevil
504 (*Hylobius abietis*) damage to newly planted Norway spruce seedlings. *Ann For Sci* 60:
505 667–671
- 506 42. Paavilainen E, Päivänen J (1995) Peatland forestry ecology and principles. *Ecological*
507 *Studies*, vol. 111. Springer-Verlag, Berlin
- 508 43. Preisser EL, Strong DR (2004) Climate affects predator control of an herbivore outbreak.
509 *Am. Nat.* 163: 754–762
- 510 44. Renou F, Farrell EP (2005) Reclaiming peatlands for forestry the Irish Experience. In:
511 Stanturf JA, Madsen P (eds) *Restoration of Boreal and Temperate Forests*, Boca Raton:
512 CRC Press

- 513 45. Shapiro-Ilan D, Han R, Dolinski C (2012) Entomopathogenic nematode production and
514 application technology. *J Nematol* 44:206–217
- 515 46. Stock P, Griffin CT, Burnell AM (2002) Morphological characterisation of three isolates
516 of *Heterorhabditis* Poinar, 1997 from the ‘Irish group’ (Nematoda: Rhabditida:
517 Heterorhabditidae) and additional evidence supporting their recognition as a distinct
518 species, *H. downesi* sp. *Syst Parasitol* 51: 95–106
- 519 47. Tan JY, Wainhouse D, Day KR, Morgan G (2010) Flight ability and reproductive
520 development in newly emerged pine weevil *Hylobius abietis* and potential effects of
521 climate change. *Agric Forest Entomol* 12: 427–434
- 522 48. Torr PS, Wilson MJ, Heritage S (2005) Forestry applications. In: Grewal PS, Ehlers R-U,
523 Shapiro-Ilan DI (eds), *Nematodes as biocontrol agents*. CABI Publishing, Oxfordshire,
524 pp 281–293
- 525 49. Turlings TCJ, Hiltbold I, Rasmann S (2012) The importance of root-produced volatiles
526 as foraging cues for entomopathogenic nematodes. *Plant and Soil* 358: 51 – 60
- 527 50. von Sydow F, Birgersson G (1997) Conifer stump condition and pine weevil (*Hylobius*
528 *abietis*) reproduction. *Can J For Res* 27: 1254–1262
- 529 51. Wainhouse D, Brough S, Greenacre B (2007) *Managing the Pine Weevil on Lowland*
530 *Pine*. Forestry Commission
531 [http://www.forestry.gov.uk/pdf/FCPN014.pdf/\\$FILE/FCPN014.pdf](http://www.forestry.gov.uk/pdf/FCPN014.pdf/$FILE/FCPN014.pdf)
- 532 52. Williams CD, Dillon AB, Harvey CD, Hennessy R, McNamara L, Griffin CT (2013a)
533 Control of a major pest of forestry, *Hylobius abietis*, with entomopathogenic nematodes
534 and fungi using eradicator and prophylactic strategies. *Forest Ecol Manag* 305 : 212-222
- 535 53. Williams CD, Dillon AB, Girling RD, Griffin CT (2013b). Organic soils promote the
536 efficacy of entomopathogenic nematodes, with different foraging strategies, in the

537 control of a major forest pest: A meta-analysis of field trial data. *Biol Control* 65: 357–
538 364

539 54. Williams CD, Dillon AB, Ennis D, Hennessy R, Griffin CT (2015) Differential
540 susceptibility of pine weevil, *Hylobius abietis* (Coleoptera: Curculionidae), larvae and
541 pupae to entomopathogenic nematodes and death of adults infected as pupae. *Biocontrol*
542 60: 537–546

543 55. Wilson MJ, Ehlers R-U, Glazer I (2012) Entomopathogenic nematode foraging
544 Strategies—is *Steinernema carpocapsae* really an ambush forager? *Nematology* 14: 389–
545 394

546 56. Wilson MJ, Wilson DJ, Rodgers A, Gerard PJ (2016) Developing a strategy for using
547 entomopathogenic nematodes to control the African black beetle (*Heteronychus arator*)
548 in New Zealand pastures and investigating temperature constraints. *Biol control* 93: 1-7

549 57. Wheeler BD (1995) Introduction: restoration and wetlands. In Wheeler BD, Shaw SC,
550 Fojt WJ, Robertson RA (eds) *Restoration of temperate wetlands*, John Wiley & sons,
551 Chichester, pp. 1-18

552 **Table 1.** Location and characteristics of field sites.

553

Site name	Location	Altitude	Soil type	Felling month/year	Application date
Cloondara	Co. Longford 53°44'16.7"N 7°54'15.7"W	41m	Peat ¹	04-05/2013	12/06/2014
Knockaville	Co. Westmeath 53°29'25.9"N 7°13'46.0"W	95m	Peat ²	07-08/2013	10/06/2014
Killurney	Co. Tipperary 52°25'01.5"N 7°36'13.0"W	371m	Mineral ³	03-04/2013	13/06/2014
Clonoghil	Co. Laois 52°58'45.8"N 7°37'35.5"W	127m	Peat ²	04-06/2013	27/05/2015
Doon	Co. Offaly 53°19'53.6"N 7°51'42.3"W	57m	Peat ²	03-03/2014	03/06/2015
Tigroney	Co. Wicklow 52°53'04.5"N 6°12'11.6"W	207m	Mineral ³	06-08/2013	17/06/2015
Gurtnapisha	Co. Tipperary 52°26'33.3"N 7°33'32.9"W	466m	Mineral ⁴	01-02/2014	09/06/2015

554 ¹Fen peat ²Raised bog/cutaway ³Lithosol/regosol ⁴Acid brown earths/brown podsols

555

556

557

558

559

560

561

562

563

564

565 **Table 2.** Population structure and abundance of *Hylobius abietis* in control stumps four weeks post application and comparison with number of
 566 weevils caught in emergence traps over the remainder of the season.
 567

Site name (no. stumps)	% larvae	% pupae	% adults	totals	% weevils within 20cm depth	% weevils within 50cm distance from bole	Hacking* average \pm SE	Difference** from emergence
Cloondara (10)	38.02	33.33	28.64	192	77.73%	97.8%	76.8 \pm 11.2	t = 0.74 P = 0.465
Knockaville (10)	53.03	33.03	13.95	215	71.06%	96.5%	86.0 \pm 22.9	t = 1.33 P = 0.19
Killurney (10)	18.18	68.18	13.63	132	90.9%	98.3%	52.8 \pm 9.4	t = 3.50 P < 0.05
Clonoghil (8)	89.47	10.53	0.00	304	45.02%	71.8%	152 \pm 26.9	t = 0.30 P = 0.076
Doon (6)	50.25	49.25	0.50	197	70.28%	75.6%	131.3 \pm 24.9	t = 3.27 P < 0.05
Tigroney (4)	4.54	88.64	6.82	44	68.98%	96.3%	44 \pm 12.1	t = 0.12 P = 0.902
Gurtnapisha (6)	76.00	24.00	0.00	75	85.62%	85.6%	50 \pm 12.5	t = 3.90 P < 0.05

568

569 *Estimated per stump after multiplying by 4

570 ** difference between number of weevils found per stump at hacking (ca. four weeks post application) and number of adult weevils collected in
 571 traps erected over control stumps (compare with control graphs of figures 5 & 6).

572

573

574

575

576

577

578

579 **Table 3.** The effect of nematode species and site on the emergence of adult *Hylobius abietis*.
580 (control stumps are excluded).
581

Source	2014			2015		
	d.f	F	P	d.f	F	P
Species	1	1.07	0.306	1	0.01	0.930
Site	2	0.77	0.468	3	27.87	< 0.001
Species \times Site	2	1.37	0.262	3	0.25	0.861
Error	54			72		
Total	59			79		

582

583

584

585

586

587

588

589

590

591 **FIGURE LEGENDS**

592 **Figure 1.** *Hylobius abietis* distribution (depth from soil surface and distance from bole in cm)
593 in pine stumps.

594 **Figure 2.** Percentage parasitism of *Hylobius abietis* by *Heterorhabditis downesi* and
595 *Steinernema carpocapsae* in stumps at different sites in 2014 (a) and 2015 (b). Bars show
596 average values with asymmetrical, quasi-binomially distributed standard errors.

597 Abbreviations: Peat. = peaty soil type, min. = mineral soil type.

598 **Figure 3.** Influence of *Hylobius abietis* infestation (number of weevils/stumps) on parasitism
599 rates by entomopathogenic nematodes across different sites. Regression lines are added for
600 the sites in year 2015 wherein there was a significant relationship.

601 **Figure 4.** The influence of depth below soil level (a) and distance from the bole of the stump
602 (b) on parasitism rates of *Hylobius abietis* by entomopathogenic nematodes. Data are
603 presented across different sites (logistic analysis of co-variance) and are slightly displaced
604 vertically for clarity. Abbreviations provided regarding and the soil type (peat. and min. for
605 peaty and mineral soils, respectively) and year (2014 and 2015).

606 **Figure 5.** Numbers of adult *Hylobius abietis* (average \pm s.e.) emerging from control stumps
607 and stumps treated with entomopathogenic nematodes (*Heterorhabditis downesi* and
608 *Steinernema carpocapsae*) across three sites in the year 2014. Capital letter above bars show
609 significantly different treatments across all sites (Tukey-Kramer test), asterisks show Fisher's
610 (LSD) post-hoc tests within each site separately. Checkmarks denote treatments wherein
611 weevil numbers are less than 20/stump (denoted by the horizontal dashed line).

612 **Figure 6.** Numbers of adult *Hylobius abietis* (average \pm s.e.) emerging from control stumps
613 and stumps treated with entomopathogenic nematodes (*Heterorhabditis downesi* and
614 *Steinernema carpocapsae*) across three sites in the year 2015. Capital letter above bars show
615 significantly different treatments across all sites (Tukey-Kramer test), asterisks show Fisher's

616 (LSD) post-hoc tests within each site separately. Checkmarks denote treatments wherein
617 weevil numbers are less than 20/stump (denoted by the horizontal dashed line).

618

619

620

621

622

623

624

625

626

627

628

629

630

631

632

633

634

635

636


637

638

639

640

Figure 1




641

642

643

Figure 2




644

645

646

Figure 3



647

648

Figure 4





Figure 4

649


650

Figure 5



651

Figure 6



652