Do pheromone traps help to reduce new attacks of *Ips typographus* at the local scale after a sanitary cut?

Alexandre Kuhn [Corresp., 1] , **Louis Hautier** [1] , **Gilles San Martin** [1]

[1] Crops and Forest Health Unit, Life Sciences Department, Walloon Agricultural Research Centre, Gembloux, Belgium

Corresponding Author: Alexandre Kuhn
Email address: a.kuhn@cra.wallonie.be

The spruce bark beetle, *Ips typographus*, is causing severe economic losses during epidemic phases triggered by droughts and/or windstorms. Sanitation felling and salvage logging are usually the most recommended strategies to limit the damages. However, any additional control method to limit the economic impact of an outbreak would be welcome. In this respect, the efficiency of pheromone trapping is still controversial or poorly documented.

In this two-year study (2020-2021), at the peak of a severe outbreak in Belgium, we quantified the wood volume and presence/absence of new attacks at 126 sites attacked during the previous year and within 100 m from the initial attack. Each site was randomly allocated to one of three treatments: 1) three crosstraps baited with pheromones, 2) one tree-trap baited with pheromones and treated with an insecticide and 3) control sites with no trapping device. The attacked trees of the previous year were all cut and removed before the start of the experiment and newly attacked trees were removed as they were detected. The trapping devices were only active during spring to target overwintering bark beetles that might have escaped the sanitation cuts and to limit the risk of attracting dispersing beetles from outside the patch during the summer.

We found a strong decrease of the attacks relative to the previous year in all treatments, including the controls (more than 50% of the control sites had no new attacks). There was no relationship between the new attacks and the attacks of the previous year. In both years, new attacks were more frequent (presence/absence) in sites with crosstraps (95% Confidence Interval: 56-84% of the sites with new attacks) than in sites with a tree-trap (26-57% - p=0.02) and to a lesser extent than in control sites (32-63%, p=0.08). In 2020, the attacked volumes were slightly higher in sites with crosstraps (95% Confidence Interval: 3.4-14.2 m³) than in control sites (0.2-3.5 m³, p = 0.04) and no significant difference was found with tree-trap sites (1.1-6.2 m³, p = 0.38). In 2021, there were no significant differences between the volumes attacked in the control sites (1.8-9.4 m³), crosstraps sites (0.9-6.4 m³) and tree-trap sites (0-2.5 m³).

Overall, we found no evidence in favor of the efficacy of pheromone trapping during spring to reduce economic damages at the local scale when combined with sanitation felling and during a severe outbreak. The use of baited crosstraps could even be hazardous as it seemed to increase the occurrence of new attacks probably by attracting bark beetles but failing to neutralize them.

1 **Do pheromone traps help to reduce new attacks of *Ips***
2 ***typographus* at the local scale after a sanitary cut?**

3 Alexandre Kuhn[1], Louis Hautier[1], Gilles San Martin[1]
4
5
6
7
8 [1] Crops and Forest Health Unit, Life Sciences Department, Walloon Agricultural
9 Research Centre, Gembloux, Belgium
10
11 Corresponding Author:
12 Alexandre Kuhn[1]
13 Rue de Liroux, 2, Gembloux, 5030, Belgium
14 Email address: a.kuhn@cra.wallonie.be

Abstract

The spruce bark beetle, *Ips typographus*, is causing severe economic losses during epidemic phases triggered by droughts and/or windstorms. Sanitation felling and salvage logging are usually the most recommended strategies to limit the damages. However, any additional control method to limit the economic impact of an outbreak would be welcome. In this respect, the efficiency of pheromone trapping is still controversial or poorly documented.

In this two-year study (2020-2021), at the peak of a severe outbreak in Belgium, we quantified the wood volume and presence/absence of new attacks at 126 sites attacked during the previous year and within 100 m from the initial attack. Each site was randomly allocated to one of three treatments: 1) three crosstraps baited with pheromones, 2) one tree-trap baited with pheromones and treated with an insecticide and 3) control sites with no trapping device. The attacked trees of the previous year were all cut and removed before the start of the experiment and newly attacked trees were removed as they were detected. The trapping devices were only active during spring to target overwintering bark beetles that might have escaped the sanitation cuts and to limit the risk of attracting dispersing beetles from outside the patch during the summer.

We found a strong decrease of the attacks relative to the previous year in all treatments, including the controls (more than 50% of the control sites had no new attacks). There was no relationship between the new attacks and the attacks of the previous year. In both years, new attacks were more frequent (presence/absence) in sites with crosstraps (95% Confidence Interval: 56-84% of the sites with new attacks) than in sites with a tree-trap (26-57% - p=0.02) and to a lesser extent than in control sites (32-63%, p=0.08). In 2020, the attacked volumes were slightly higher in sites with crosstraps (95% Confidence Interval: 3.4-14.2 m³) than in control sites (0.2-3.5 m³, p = 0.04) and no significant difference was found with tree-trap sites (1.1-6.2 m³, p = 0.38). In 2021, there were no significant differences between the volumes attacked in the control sites (1.8-9.4 m³), crosstraps sites (0.9-6.4 m³) and tree-trap sites (0-2.5 m³).

Overall, we found no evidence in favor of the efficacy of pheromone trapping during spring to reduce economic damages at the local scale when combined with sanitation felling and during a severe outbreak. The use of baited crosstraps could even be hazardous as it seemed to increase the occurrence of new attacks probably by attracting bark beetles but failing to neutralize them.

Introduction

48 The spruce bark beetle, *Ips typographus* (L.), is a phloem-feeding insect native to Eurasia which
49 typically feed and breed on weakened or wind-felled Norway spruces (*Picea abies* Karst.). Its
50 populations periodically erupt into large-scale outbreaks after severe droughts and windstorms,
51 switching from stressed trees to healthy ones. This beetle is considered as a keystone forest
52 species and an ecosystem engineer as it profoundly alters forest structure by promoting
53 heterogeneity in forest landscapes, which increases biodiversity (Müller et al., 2008; Lehnert et
54 al., 2013; Beudert et al., 2015). However, it is also regarded as the most important forest pest in
55 Europe due to its major impact on wood economy (Grégoire & Evans, 2004; Wermelinger,
56 2004).
57   Unprecedented outbreaks have marked European spruce forests in recent decades and
58 climate change is expected to further increase the frequency and the magnitude of these events
59 (Marini et al., 2012, 2017; Mezei et al., 2017). The modification of the current cultural practices
60 and the diversification of tree species within the stands are promising ways to mitigate bark
61 beetles disturbances in the long run (Jactel et al., 2009; Griess et al., 2012; Dobor, Hlásny &
62 Zimová, 2020; Jactel, Moreira & Castagneyrol, 2021). However, switching to more resilient
63 forests takes time and *I. typographus* outbreaks should be properly managed in existing spruce
64 stands to secure wood supply and mitigate socio-economic losses.
65   Currently, short-term strategies to limit *I. typographus* population growth mainly rely on
66 two complementary methods: salvage logging and sanitary felling (Wermelinger, 2004; Fettig &
67 Hilszczański, 2015). Salvage logging aims to remove highly attractive breeding material, such as
68 wind-felled timbers, before it is colonized by bark beetles. Sanitary felling relies on the regular
69 search for and removal of already infested trees. Although sanitation felling is considered the
70 most effective direct control approach to reduce tree mortality (Wichmann & Ravn, 2001;
71 Wermelinger, 2004; Stadelmann et al., 2013), it has some disadvantages. To be effective,
72 infested trees have to be harvested before the emergence of the next generation, which usually
73 takes between four and six weeks, depending on temperatures (Wermelinger & Seifert, 1999).
74 This deadline is sometimes difficult to meet as not all infested trees show clear symptoms.
75 Furthermore, in epidemic phases, interventions are often limited due to human resources
76 shortage to deal with the overwhelming amount of timber to collect. In addition, detection is
77 highly time consuming, logging is not always possible in remote places and it can remove natural
78 enemy communities building in infested trees.
79   An alternative method of direct control is to trap and kill flying adults. Since the 19th
80 century (Pfeil, 1827), foresters have taken advantage of the natural attractiveness of voluntarily
81 felled trees and logs to concentrate and neutralize bark beetles. As for sanitation felling, natural
82 tree-traps require regular attention to harvest or debark them before immature stages achieve
83 their cycle and fly away, resulting in increased numbers of beetles in the environment.
84 Furthermore, the attractiveness of natural tree-traps may be masked in the presence of stressed
85 standing trees and the beetles may spread to the latter. Finally, tree-traps can only capture a
86 limited number of beetles before they become unattractive. In the late 70s, the aggregation

87 pheromone blend of *I. typographus* was identified (Bakke, Frøyen & Skattebøl, 1977). This gave
88 a new impetus in bark beetle management research and a diverse array of pheromone-baited
89 traps were developed and tested. Mass-trapping was readily adopted as part of integrated pest
90 management programs and thousands of baited traps were deployed in Europe to control *I.*
91 *typographus* outbreaks. There is an extensive literature comparing the efficiency of different trap
92 types and attractants in terms of the number of beetles caught (Drumont et al., 1992; Raty et al.,
93 1995; Galko et al., 2016; Holuša et al., 2017; Blaženec, Majdák & Jakuš, 2021; Heber et al.,
94 2021; Lindmark, Wallin & Jonsson, 2022). Catches appear to be quite variable and highly
95 influenced by various factors such as weather conditions, sun exposure, trap density and
96 disposition or bark beetle population levels (Bakke, 1992; Lobinger & Skatulla, 1996; Galko et
97 al., 2016). Despite the impressive number of beetles caught by mass-trapping campaigns (e.g. 7.8
98 billion in Sweden between 1979 and 1980; Bakke, 1989), a growing number of scientists and
99 practitioners have questioned the effect of trapping in the effective reduction of *I. typographus*
100 population and damages. One claim against mass-trapping is the negligible share of the bark
101 beetle population actually caught during an outbreak with a reasonable number of traps (Weslien
102 & Lindelöw, 1990; Weslien, 1992; Grégoire et al., 1997; Grégoire & Nageleisen, 2019). With a
103 high trapping intensity, it was estimated that between 5% (4 traps/100 ha) and 30% (15 traps/100
104 ha) of the population could be caught (Weslien & Lindelöw, 1990; Weslien, 1992). Drumont et
105 al. (1992) found that, on average, each tree-trap (baited with pheromone and sprayed with
106 insecticide) captured less than half the hibernating population from a single previously infested
107 tree. Furthermore, most marked-recapture experiments indicated that only a small proportion (up
108 to 10%) of released beetles (newly emerging or re-emerging, depending on the studies) respond
109 to pheromones from local baited-traps (Weslien & Lindelöw, 1990; Zolubas & Byers, 1995;
110 Franklin, Debruyne & Gregoire, 2000; Dolezal, Okrouhlik & Davidkova, 2016; but see Duelli et
111 al., 1997 for recaptures up to 35%). Grégoire and Nageleisen (2019) estimated that, in the
112 absence of effective sanitary felling, 20 tree-traps or 60 artificial pheromone traps would be
113 necessary to neutralize this 10% fraction of a 100 m³ infestation spot susceptible to perform local
114 attacks. These results – although based on indirect measurements and several approximations
115 that could lead to large uncertainties – suggest that traps alone are not able to contain bark beetle
116 outbreaks at the landscape scale. Nevertheless, combined with other control measures (like
117 sanitary felling), pheromone traps might contribute to reduce the economic damage caused by
118 *Ips typographus* at a more local scale, for example by eliminating overwintering adults that could
119 start new attacks in the spring close to previously infested spots (Grégoire & Nageleisen, 2019).
120 During severe outbreaks, a simple reduction of 10-20% of the spruce volumes attacked might
121 still be an important economic gain that should be balanced with the environmental and
122 economic costs of trapping. However, this should be properly evaluated by direct measures of
123 damage reduction rather than indirect measures (like number of insects caught). Yet, the
124 scientific literature seems to be rather poor in this respect, which is surprising given the
125 economic importance of the issue.

126   Some studies do report the evolution of *I. typographus* damages over time in the presence
127 of trapping devices. Unfortunately, most are case studies lacking control sites without traps or
128 with a very limited number of controls (one or two) located in areas differing from the
129 experimental areas in many aspects. The lack of a proper comparison point prevents any
130 conclusion to be drawn from these studies on the real contribution of trapping to damage
131 reduction (Abgrall & Schvester, 1987; Bakke, 1989; Vité, 1989; Bombosch & Dedek, 1994;
132 Jakuš, 1998, 2001; Pfister & Hueber, 2008). To the best of our knowledge, only a single
133 published study properly compared damage with or without traps (Faccoli & Stergulc, 2008).
134 They selected 24 previously attacked spots and monitored the volume of new attacks in the
135 presence (pheromone slot-traps, standing trap-logs and horizontal trap-logs; six sites each) or in
136 the absence of trapping devices (six control sites) during the next year. They found a dramatic
137 decrease in new attacks (average reduction of about 80% relative to the previous year) in all sites
138 with traps (whatever the trap type), while the level of new attacks remained high in the control
139 sites. The results of this study suggest that trapping at a local scale may induce a strong
140 economic gain at the stand level, even though its effect on the total bark beetle population is
141 assumed to be negligible (see above).
142   In 2018, a massive *I. typographus* outbreak emerged in Belgium, triggered by repeated
143 droughts and a winter windstorm (OWSF, 2018). Warm and dry conditions favored bark beetle
144 development and the appearance of a third annual generation, leading to unprecedented
145 population levels and dramatic economic losses. In this context, the controversy over trapping
146 efficiency resurfaced among forest managers as any additional control method to limit the impact
147 of the epidemic would be welcome. In this study, we evaluated the potential of pheromone
148 trapping for damage reduction in previously infested patches during a severe outbreak in the
149 Belgian landscape and climatic context. We regarded trapping as a complementary control
150 method to sanitation felling to reduce local attacks and attenuate economic losses. Our objective
151 was not to test the efficiency of large scale mass-trapping to curb the outbreak. During a two-
152 year experiment, we assessed the effect of two trapping modalities, panel crosstraps and tree-
153 traps, relative to control sites without trapping devices. To maximize the chances of trapping
154 success while minimizing the risks, traps were only left in place during the spring to catch the
155 overwintering spruce bark beetles, when the population level at the landscape scale is the lowest
156 and when the trees have replenished their water reserves. The rationale behind this choice was to
157 improve the efficiency of sanitary cuts with the objective of extinguishing local infestation
158 patches by capturing as much as possible of all remaining bark beetles from the first
159 (overwintering) generation that could have escaped the sanitation felling from the previous year.
160 At the same time, by removing the traps before the emergence of the second generation in
161 summer, we wanted to limit the risk of attracting dispersing beetles from outside the patch at a
162 time when population level at the landscape scale is at its highest (Baier, Pennerstorfer &
163 Schopf, 2007) and the risk of saturating the traps is higher.
164
165

166 **Material and methods**

167 Experimental sites

168 Experimental sites consisted of infested patches within spruce stands with active bark beetle
169 attacks during the summer and/or autumn of the year preceding the year of the experiment
170 (attacks in 2019 for the 2020 experiment and attacks in 2020 for the 2021 experiment). We only
171 selected sites with relatively circumscribed attacks and without other infested patches active
172 during the previous year within a 250 m radius. In all selected sites, the forest officers had
173 carried out a sanitary clear-cut to remove the trees attacked the previous year from the forest
174 before the next spring.

175   A total of 126 sites were included in the experiment: 68 in 2020 and 58 in 2021. All sites
176 were located in the Belgian Ardennes, a natural region where the ecological conditions are
177 generally considered as suitable for Norway spruces by local foresters (Petit et al., 2017); Fig. 1).
178 Ninety-three percent of the sites (117/126) were located in public forest stands, across seven
179 forest districts of the Department of Nature and Forest. In 2021, 9 sites were located in private
180 forest stands managed by a single owner.

181

182 Experimental set-up

183 Three treatments were tested: (1) artificial trapping device (hereafter referred to as "crosstraps";
184 Fig. 2A), (2) tree-trap device ("tree-trap"; Fig. 2B) and (3) the absence of any trapping device
185 ("control"). For tree-trap sites, a single healthy tree was felled, unbranched and placed in the
186 approximate center of the clear-cut area of the patch, as far as possible from healthy trees of the
187 clear-cut edges. Three Ipsowit® pheromone dispensers (Witasek, Austria) were placed evenly
188 along the colder side (North or East if possible) of the tree-trap. The bark of the tree-trap was
189 sprayed with an insecticide solution (1 g of lambda-cyhalothrin diluted in 1 L of water; Karate
190 Zeon®, Syngenta, Belgium) under dry weather conditions and until the bark was soaked. For
191 crosstrap sites, three cross-vane panel traps (Witasek, Austria) were hung on wooden stakes
192 about 1.5 m high. The crosstraps were arranged in line or in triangle (depending on the clear-cut
193 shape), 3 to 10 m apart, and placed approximately in the center of the clear-cut, as far as possible
194 from healthy trees of the clear-cut edges. Each crosstrap was supplied with a single Ipsowit®
195 pheromone dispenser (Witasek, Austria). Trap collectors were filled with water. For control sites,
196 no trapping device was set-up. Whatever the size of the initial infested patch, the number of tree-
197 traps was always one per site and the number of crosstraps was always three per site.

198   To limit site heterogeneity between treatments, the treatments were (as far as possible)
199 evenly distributed among and randomly distributed within forest districts subunits (Fig. 1). These
200 subunits, corresponding to smaller geographic entities, usually present similar environmental
201 conditions, and are managed by a single forest officer.

202   The trapping devices (tree-traps and crosstraps) were set-up at the beginning of April,
203 before the first *Ips typographus* flights, and removed at the beginning of July. We focused on the
204 first – overwintering – generation to limit the risk of trap saturation with too many beetles from
205 the second generation (up to three generations per year in Belgium during this outbreak). The

206 pheromone dispensers were replaced after six weeks (mid-May) and the insecticide treatment of
207 the tree-traps was renewed at the same period. The collectors of the crosstraps were emptied
208 approximately every week by forest officers. Throughout the study period (2020 and 2021),
209 forestry officers inspected the sites on a regular basis as they would normally do in any forest
210 stand. New infestations were treated by sanitary felling (as recommended for bark beetle
211 management in Belgium) for all treatments (tree-trap, crosstraps and control).
212

213 Number of insects captured by the crosstraps
214 To monitor the phenology of *I. typographus* flights and check that the traps were working, the
215 number of bark beetles captured by the crosstraps was estimated based on their fresh volume. To
216 estimate the average number of beetles per ml, we counted the number of individuals in 24
217 subsamples of trap captures with volumes ranging from 4 ml to 40 ml. The average number of
218 beetles per ml showed little variation: 38 ± 4.4 individuals/ml (average $\pm$ SD). The weekly
219 volume of bark beetles captured in each collector was measured. The samples with a volume ≥ 5
220 ml were converted with this volumetric method. For samples with a volume < 5 ml, the exact
221 number of bark beetles was counted or roughly assumed to be equal to 100 bark beetles. In 2020,
222 bark beetle volumes were only available for the Bièvre forest district (five crosstrap sites).
223

224 Attack data acquisition
225 In 2020, new attacks on healthy trees were recorded by forest officers in three areas increasingly
226 distant from the center of the clear-cut for each site: 0-50 m, 50-100 m or beyond 100 m from the
227 center (but inside the same spruce stand). In 2021, new attacks were only recorded within a 100
228 m radius from the center of the initial clear-cut as most new attacks occurred close to the
229 previously infested patch (see Results - Attacks at various distances from the patch center). This
230 is also consistent with previous studies indicating that between 65% and 85% of new attacks
231 occur within 100 m from old attacks (Wichmann & Ravn, 2001; Kautz et al., 2011; Potterf et al.,
232 2019). When the clear-cut is very large and encompasses a large part of the 50 m radius zone, the
233 number of trees remaining in this zone can be low and we therefore chose to merge the 0-50 m
234 and 50-100 m zones. Although the traps were only active in spring (see above), we recorded the
235 wood volume of newly attacked trees over the entire period of *I. typographus* activity (from
236 spring to winter). The evolution of the attacks throughout the year was not recorded; only the
237 final wood volume and the number of trees attacked were available.
238

239 Data analyses
240 The statistical analyses and graphs were performed with the R programming language (R Core
241 Team, 2022). All the data and R scripts needed to reproduce our results are available in a public
242 figshare repository (see the Data Availability section).
243

244 *Sites homogeneity between trapping treatments*

245 Before investigating the effect of trapping on new attacks, we checked that the sites attributed to
246 the three treatments were similar on average in terms of environmental conditions, based on
247 several variables describing the sites : number of trees and wood volume initially attacked in the
248 patch, stand age, slope and orientation of the stand, clear-cut area of the patch, remaining spruce
249 area around the patch, ecological suitability of the stand for Norway spruce and weather
250 variables during the previous winter and during the period of activity of the bark beetles
251 (temperature, precipitations, solar irradiance, relative humidity and wind speed) (detailed
252 description of the variables in the supplements, section 2.2). Basically, we compared the
253 quantitative descriptors with simple ANOVA and the qualitative descriptors with chi-squared
254 tests with simulated p-values (to avoid problems with categories with no or few observations).
255
256 *Impact of trapping treatments on new attacks*
257 We used a linear model (ANCOVA) to compare the new volume attacked between treatments
258 with log(x+1) transformed volume as response and year, treatment and their interaction as
259 qualitative explanatory variables. We also added two continuous explanatory variables to the
260 model: the initial volume attacked in the patch (during the previous year) and the area of spruce
261 available for new attacks within a radius of 100 m around the center of the initial patch. This
262 latter variable therefore represents the remaining quantity of resources available for new attacks
263 within the monitored radius. Both additional covariates were square root transformed and
264 centered on their mean value. They allow us to control statistically the variability between the
265 initial patches for these two parameters that could influence the volume of new attacks. We then
266 computed all pairwise comparisons between the three treatments with p-value correction (Post-
267 hoc tests, single-step method from multcomp R package, (Hothorn, Bretz & Westfall, 2008;
268 Bretz et al., 2010) and we report the 95% confidence intervals around the values predicted by the
269 model. Because new volumes of 0 m³ were frequent, we also compared the proportion of sites
270 with or without new attacks (presence/absence data) between the three treatments with a
271 Generalized Linear Model (GLM) with binomial distribution. The rest of the analysis is similar
272 to the linear model for volumes except the use of Likelihood Ratio (LR) tests for the main
273 "analysis of deviance" table instead of the classical analysis of variance table.
274   Residual plots were used to check the conditions of application of the model (mostly :
275 linearity, variance and distribution of the residuals, outliers) and guided the choice of the
276 logarithmic and square root transformations (Fox, 2002; Zuur, Ieno & Smith, 2007; see
277 Supplements, sections 3.1.5 and 3.2.5). We also checked for the absence of spatial correlation
278 between the residuals of the model with spline correlograms (R package ncf, Bjornstad, 2020).

Results

Homogeneity of the sites

We found no statistically significant differences between the three treatments in terms of site characteristics except for the site slope (see Supplements, section 2.2 for details). Tree-trap sites tended to have null slopes more frequently and low, medium or steep slopes less frequently than the other treatments (chi squared test with simulated p-value: x^2=12.86, p=0.045). Therefore, the sites were globally very similar between the treatments.

Number of insects captured in the crosstraps

In 2021, we captured between 8000 and 45000 individuals in each crosstrap site over an average period of 80 days (sum of the three crosstraps, between 2000 and 22000 individuals for each trap). In 2020, we obtained an estimate for only five sites from a single forest district, with 66000 to 118000 individuals captured per site (between 27000 and 45000 per trap).

We found no association between the number of individuals captured and the volume of new attacks on crosstraps sites in 2021 (log-log linear regression: slope = 0.29, s.e. = 0.48, t = 0.61, p = 0.55 – see Supplements, section 2.3.3).

Attacks at various distances from the patch center

In 2020 only, we measured the volumes of new attacks at three distances from the center of the initial patch: 0-50 m, 50-100 m and beyond 100 m but within the spruce stand (Fig. 3). The highest level of attacks was observed within 0-50 m from the patch center and decreased between 50 and 100 m. Beyond 100 m, the average volume attacked is lower than between 0-50 m but in a few sites we observed high levels of attacks that might be independent of the initial patch (Fig. 3).

We decided to sum the attacks between 0 and 100 m which are more likely to be related to the initial attack in the patch and also because the volumes of attacks between 0 and 100m are highly correlated (on log transformed values) with both the volumes attacked between 0-50 m (r = 0.95) and the volumes of the whole stand (r = 0.92). In 2021, we measured only the levels of attacks between 0 and 100m.

Surprisingly, the correlations between the new attacks and the initial volume attacked during the previous year are low (between r = 0.07 for volumes beyond 100 m and r = 0.24 for the attacks between 50 and 100m; see Supplements, section 2.4.2 for details).

Decrease of new attacks relative to the initial volume attacked

For both years of the study, we observed a strong decrease of the new volumes attacked relative to the initial attacks of the previous year in all treatments including the control sites without any traps (Fig. 4). In many sites, there were simply no new attacks (e.g. 62% of the control sites in 2020 and 40% in 2021 had no new attacks). The global trends seem to be similar between both years despite the fact that the epidemic phase at the regional scale reached a peak in 2020 with a decrease of the levels of attack in 2021 (OWSF, 2021).

319

Effect of trapping on wood volumes attacked

320 Table 1 summarizes the statistical analysis for the volume of new attacks (see Supplements,
321 section 3.1 for details). We found no significant association between the volume of new attacks
322 and the initial volume attacked nor the available area of spruce within 100 m. The year x
323 treatment interaction is however significant ($F_{2,116}$ = 16.8, p = 0.02) which means that there are
324 differences between the treatments but they are not the same for both years. So, we computed all
325 pairwise comparisons between treatments within each year. These results are summarized on Fig.
326 5 with letters (see also Supplements, section 3.1.3 for details).
327   In 2020, the volumes of new attacks in crosstraps sites (95% Confidence Interval CI: 3.4-
328 14.2 m³) were slightly but significantly (t = 2.71, p =0.04) more important than in control sites
329 (95% CI: 0.2-3.5 m³). We observed no significant differences with treetrap sites (95% CI: 1.1-
330 6.2 m³) (Fig. 5). In 2021, we found no significant differences between the volumes of new
331 attacks in tree-trap sites (95% CI: 0-2.5 m³), crosstraps sites (95% CI: 0.9-6.4 m³) and control
332 sites (95% CI: 1.8-9.4 m³) (Fig. 5).

334

Effect of trapping on presence/absence of new attacks

335 Table 2 summarizes the statistical analysis for the proportion of sites with new attacks (see
336 Supplements, section 3.2 for details). We found a positive association with the area of available
337 spruce within 100 m (Likelihood Ratio LR = 7.95, df = 1, p = 0.005) but no association with the
338 initial volume attacked. The year x treatment interaction and year main effect are not significant
339 but we found a significant treatment main effect (LR = 8.57, df = 2, p = 0.014) which means that
340 there are differences between treatments but that these differences are similar between years. So,
341 we computed all pairwise comparisons between all treatments for both years together (using the
342 averaged predictions for both years). These results are summarized on Fig. 6 with letters (see
343 also Supplements, section 3.2.3 for details).
344   New attacks are significantly (z = -2.64, p = 0.02) more frequent in crosstraps sites (95%
345 CI: 56-84 % of sites with new attacks) than in tree-trap sites (95% CI: 26-57%). The control sites
346 show intermediate predicted values (95% CI: 32-63%) with no significant differences with the
347 two other treatments (Fig. 6).

Discussion

We found no evidence that the presence of trapping devices in forest stands previously infested by *Ips typographus* could contribute to reducing the probability nor the intensity of new attacks. On the contrary, sites with crosstraps seemed to show increased risk of new attacks. On the other hand, we globally observed a substantial damage reduction in all three treatments compared to the initial infestation levels and even no new attacks at all for half of the control sites. We also found no correlation between the initial levels of attack and the volume or probability of new attacks.

Several non-mutually exclusive hypotheses may explain why the traps did not contribute to damage reduction in our experimental sites. One might wonder whether our traps were fully functional. The average catches of our crosstraps (2267 and 743 beetles per trap per week in 2020 and 2021, respectively) were similar or greater than average catches reported in the literature with standard pheromone traps active during epidemic periods (between 600 and 1700 beetles per trap per week; Raty et al., 1995; Faccoli & Stergulc, 2008; Galko et al., 2016; Grodzki, 2021). This indicates that both the crosstraps and the attractants were functional, attracting and catching large numbers of beetles. We did not record the number of beetles caught by the tree-traps since this is less straightforward than for the crosstraps and it was not the goal of this study. However, given that tree-traps were baited with the same quantity of attractants as the crosstraps, and that almost no galleries were found under their bark (indicating that the insecticide was active during the entire trapping period), we can assume that the tree-traps were also fully functional. Even though our traps collected similar quantities of beetles than other studies, it might still be negligible relative to the large number of beetles present in the environment during this severe outbreak. These beetles may originate from the clear-cut (overwintering beetles), but also from other stands further away (dispersing beetles flying over the clear-cut by chance). *Ips typographus* has good dispersal capacities (Valeria et al., 2016; Ellestrand et al., 2022; Müller et al., 2022) and many specimens from foreign forest stands are likely to be attracted by pheromone traps when transiting by the experimental patches (Weslien & Lindelöw, 1989). It is also possible that sanitation felling is so effective to reduce the new attacks that adding traps makes little difference.

Not only the presence of trapping devices did not reduce *I. typographus* infestations, but sites with crosstraps also showed a higher probability of being attacked (56-84 % of crosstrap sites with new attacks according to our model predictions). As stated above, it seems that the pheromones attracted additional beetles to the patches (or prevented local beetles to disperse) but that the crosstraps were not efficient enough to neutralize them, inducing attacks on the surrounding trees. This could be due to the fact that, once in the vicinity of the traps, a combination of visual cues and random processes may also cause at least some of the attracted bark beetles to land and initiate attacks on real trees (Campbell & Borden, 2006; Saint-Germain, Buddle & Drapeau, 2007). An alternative explanation could be the saturation of the traps. The crosstraps collectors were emptied every week and were almost never totally filled with beetles. However, during flight peaks with epidemic population levels, thousands of beetles are

389 concomitantly attracted by the traps, potentially briefly saturating the collectors: if too many
390 specimens fall at the same time in the collector, a supernatant layer is likely to form, preventing
391 newly trapped beetles from drowning and allowing them to fly away. In addition, the volatiles
392 released by decomposing beetles may mask pheromones and further reduce trap efficiency
393 (Zhang et al., 2003). In comparison, tree-traps are probably more attractive - because closer to
394 natural trees - and less prone to saturation and even if some beetles fly away, they may have been
395 exposed to enough insecticide to die before damaging standing trees. Previous studies indeed
396 reported a higher efficiency of tree-traps (i.e. whole tree sprayed with insecticide and baited with
397 pheromones) compared to conventional pheromone traps (between 1.7 and 13 times more
398 effective depending on the study; Abgrall & Schvester, 1987; Drumont et al., 1992; Raty et al.,
399 1995; Grégoire et al., 1997). These efficiency estimates were however based on the number of
400 insects caught, not on the damage caused to surrounding trees.
401   In most experimental sites, including the controls, we observed a medium to strong
402 reduction in attacked volumes (Fig. 4) relative to the previous year. This could be due to a
403 natural decrease of the epidemic pressure at a regional level independent from our experimental
404 treatments. Indeed, the available epidemiological data shows that the total volume of spruce
405 attacked by *I. typographus* all over Belgium peaked in 2020 and started to decrease in 2021,
406 probably thanks to an unusually rainy weather favorable to trees but unfavorable to bark beetles
407 (OWSF, 2021). However, our study took place during two different years and we observed the
408 same strong decrease of attacks in both years, including during the 2020 year where we should
409 have observed similar or even higher levels of attacks relative to 2019. In the control sites, we
410 even had higher rates of sites without any new attacks in 2020 (60%) than in 2021 (38%). The
411 global epidemic trend thus appears a poor predictor of the observed local pattern. In line with
412 this, it was reported that a large proportion of small infestation spots may go extinct from year to
413 year with very little or no sanitation cutting effort (Kärvemo et al., 2016; S. Kärvemo *pers.*
414 *comm.*). An alternative explanation could be that the sanitation felling alone was efficient enough
415 to remove the majority of the local bark beetles and prevent most of the new attacks. We have no
416 way of explicitly testing this hypothesis with our experimental design as we have not included
417 any comparison site without sanitation felling. We didn't include such negative controls in our
418 study to keep the number of treatments low (and increase the statistical power), because of legal
419 reasons (removing attacked trees was a legal obligation in Southern Belgium up to mid 2020)
420 and also because it would have been very difficult to find forest managers who would accept to
421 take the risk of not removing attacked trees. Indeed, sanitation felling and salvage logging are the
422 most widely recommended management strategies against *I. typographus* (Wermelinger, 2004;
423 Fettig & Hilszczański, 2015; Hlásny et al., 2019). Several studies have shown that the presence
424 or the intensity of salvage logging and/or sanitation felling are associated with reduced *I.*
425 *typographus* damages (Wichmann & Ravn, 2001; Schroeder & Lindelöw, 2002; Stadelmann et
426 al., 2013; Havašová, Ferenčík & Jakuš, 2017; Miścicki & Grodzki, 2021). Potterf et al. (2019)
427 also showed that without any intervention (i.e. no management practices to reduce beetle
428 impacts), infested patches tend to grow over time, mostly during the peak and the decline of an

429 outbreak. This result is in line with several studies (including the current one) showing that most
430 of the new attacks are concentrated within a radius of 100 m around previously infested patches,
431 both in intervention (Wichmann & Ravn, 2001, the present study) and non-intervention zones
432 (Kautz et al., 2011; Potterf et al., 2019). Other authors, however, reported a different trend,
433 concluding to a negligible impact of sanitation practices on bark beetles damages, or even to a
434 higher risk of attack in the resulting clear-cuts due to an increased vulnerability of the trees
435 standing near stand edges (Grodzki et al., 2006; Mezei, 2017; Vanická et al., 2020; regarding the
436 higher risk at stand edges, see also Schroeder & Lindelöw, 2002). It is difficult to draw definitive
437 conclusions from these contradictory studies, which use an observational rather than
438 experimental approach (more experimental studies with randomized treatment allocation would
439 be difficult or impossible to implement in most cases, for practical or legal reasons). Most
440 studies compare for example large intervention and non-intervention areas from different regions
441 that may differ in many other factors than sanitary practices (e.g. non-intervention nature
442 reserves compared with stands managed for timber production). Some studies also lack true
443 replicates and most investigate the sanitary impact at the landscape scale, while our study
444 focuses on a more local effect at the stand scale.

445 Interestingly, we found no correlation between the wood volumes initially attacked in the
446 patches and the new attacks recorded during the next year. If sanitary felling does participate in
447 damage reduction and is correctly implemented, most of the local beetles from the preceding
448 season should be neutralized. Therefore, this absence of correlation is again compatible with the
449 hypothesis of a strong effect of sanitation felling. This absence of correlation may also be partly
450 due to the fact that we considered the initial volumes attacked over the whole preceding year (as
451 detailed data over time was not available) rather than the last attacks performed before the
452 winter. Only the last generation of beetles from the previous year is susceptible to participate in
453 new attacks the subsequent year.

454 Our results differ from those of Faccoli and Stergulc (2008) who conducted a similar
455 experimental study on the effect of trapping on damage reduction at the stand scale in the Italian
456 Alps. During a whole active season of *I. typographus*, they monitored new attacks on standing
457 trees around previously infested patches. Three types of trapping devices, Theysohn slot-traps,
458 standing trap-logs and lying trap-logs, were compared to control sites without traps. They
459 observed a remarkable decrease of more than 80% of the attacked volumes in all sites with
460 trapping devices relative to the previous year. By contrast, the new infestation levels remained
461 similar to the initial ones in the control sites. They concluded that traps (all three types tested)
462 efficiently reduce damages caused by *I. typographus* in previously attacked stands. In our study,
463 we also observed a strong reduction of attacked volumes, but this reduction concerned sites with
464 traps as well as control sites (See Supplements, section 4 for a comparison of both datasets). The
465 question then arises as to why similar experimental set-ups have produced such different results.
466 Several, not mutually exclusive, explanations may account for this discrepancy: differences in
467 sanitation practices, in the trapping period, in epidemic levels, in the type and density of the trap
468 used, in climatic and environmental conditions.

469   First, and perhaps most importantly, the sanitation practices differed between the two
470 studies. In both studies, the trees initially attacked during the previous year have been cut and
471 removed before the beginning of the monitoring. In our study, sanitation felling and removal of
472 newly infested trees were then performed throughout the monitoring year, whereas in the study
473 of Faccoli and Stergulc (2008), newly attacked trees were left in place (M. Faccoli *pers. comm.*).
474 In the latter case, the second generation (two generations per year in the Italian Alps at the
475 altitude of the study; M. Faccoli *pers. comm.*) of local bark beetle populations emerging from
476 infested trees should therefore be higher than with regular sanitation felling (assuming that
477 sanitation is performed on time). These beetles may have initiated new attacks in the control sites
478 but could have been partially neutralized in sites with traps (see below). The lack of damage
479 reduction observed in the six control sites by Faccoli and Stergulc (2008) strengthens the
480 hypothesis that, in our study, sanitation felling is responsible for the decrease in attacked
481 volumes. The damage reduction induced by the continuous sanitation felling might already be so
482 important that adding traps has little effect in our study. However, in the present study, we
483 observed no new attacks in 60% (2020) to 42% (2021) of the control sites. In these sites, there
484 were thus no differences in sanitation practices between the two studies since no further
485 sanitation was required after the initial clearing. A difference in sanitation practices is therefore
486 insufficient to explain the differences in attacked volumes between the two studies.
487   Second, the traps were not active during the same period between the two studies. In our
488 study, the traps were active from the beginning of April to the beginning of July and aimed at
489 neutralizing the first generation of beetles. We wanted to capture as much as possible the
490 overwintering bark beetles from the patch that could have escaped sanitation felling, while
491 limiting the risk of attracting subsequent generations of dispersing beetles from outside the patch.
492 In the study of Faccoli and Stergulc (2008), the traps were active during the whole activity
493 period of *I. typographus* (from the end of April until mid-September in the Italian Alps). This
494 prolonged period of trapping may have reduced the attacks of the second generation of beetles,
495 especially in the absence of sanitation felling. The risk of attracting beetles from outside the
496 patch or of saturating the traps with too many beetles could have been lower in the Italian
497 context given the different epidemic level (see below). In the present study, the higher levels of
498 attacks observed in sites with crosstraps placed only in the spring suggest that it would have been
499 indeed risky to extend the trapping period over the whole year at a time when the amount of
500 dispersing beetles from outside the patch is highest. However, this is only a working hypothesis
501 and the efficiency of spring vs. whole year trapping could be explicitly compared in future
502 studies.
503   Third, the epidemic level experienced during the study in Belgian spruce forests was much
504 higher than that reported in the Friuli Venezia Giulia region. Facolli and Stergulc (2008)
505 mentioned attacked wood volumes of 0.12 m³/ha in 2004, whereas it exceeded 7 m³/ha in 2019 in
506 the Walloon region (Alderweireld et al., 2015; OWSF, 2021). In the Belgian context, the traps
507 could have been less able to neutralize the overwhelming quantity of beetles present in the
508 environment.

509   Fourth, the trapping treatments were not identical between the two studies. The efficiency
510 of the pheromone traps used (Theysohn slot traps vs. crosstraps) is assumed to be similar (Galko
511 et al., 2016) but our tree-traps and the Italian trap-logs differed. We used whole timbers baited
512 and sprayed with insecticide as tree-traps. Faccoli and Stergulc (2008) tested standing and lying
513 trap-logs of 1.5 m long, also baited and sprayed with an insecticide. However, whole timber tree-
514 traps are expected to be more efficient than trap-logs (Faccoli & Stergulc, 2008). In addition,
515 they tested multiple trap densities relative to the initial wood volume attacked: 15, 30 or 40
516 m³/trap (15 m³/ trap represents the highest trapping intensity). In our study, we invariably placed
517 three crosstraps or one tree-trap per site. The density of trapping was nevertheless changing
518 between sites because the initial volume was not constant. Overall, the trapping density in our
519 study was higher or comparable to the Italian study for the crosstraps (range 3-30 m³/trap; see
520 Supplements section 4.1). Although the tree-traps and trap-logs are probably not directly
521 comparable, the densities of our tree-traps covered the whole density range tested by Faccoli and
522 Stergulc (range 5->100 m³/trap). Differences of trap types or density are thus unlikely to explain
523 the differences in results between both studies.

524   Fifth, the study of Faccoli and Stergulc (2008) was performed in the Italian Alps, while our
525 sites were distributed in the Belgian Ardennes, two regions with rather different climatic and
526 landscape contexts. In the southern part of Norway spruce distribution range, elevation is an
527 important factor for its growth due to colder temperature and water balance (e.g. Seynave et al.,
528 2005). Therefore, mountainous conditions of the Italian Alps should better fit the requirements of
529 spruce trees and enhance their resistance to bark beetle attacks. Under these conditions, even a
530 limited effect of trapping may significantly improve damage reduction if fewer insects need to be
531 caught to reduce spruce mortality.

532   Finally, we cannot rule out the possibility that the reduced number (six) of control sites
533 from the Italian study displayed no damage reduction by bad luck alone, even with low p-values
534 (false positive, type I error). Among our 40 control sites, several indeed showed similar or higher
535 damage levels compared to the initial wood volume attacked – as in the Italian study – and could
536 have been selected with a lower number of replicates (Fig. 4). This kind of study is quite difficult
537 to carry out : multiple factors may influence the levels of new attacks and induce a high
538 variability between sites and it is also costly to repeat the observations on a large number of
539 independent replicates. High variability and low number of replicates lead to low statistical
540 power which can in turn induce (1) an important risk of publication bias due to a higher
541 frequency of negative results which are less likely to be published, (2) true positive results
542 limited to very large size effects and (3) a higher frequency of false positive results relative to
543 true positive results in the published literature (Møller & Jennions, 2001; Mogil & Macleod,
544 2017). This could explain the surprisingly small number of similar studies published in the
545 scientific literature on a subject of such economic importance. Another possible reason for the
546 scarcity of the scientific literature is that many of such studies - conducted in collaboration with
547 local administrations - might be published in the gray literature in various national languages
548 difficult to understand for the broader scientific community. For example, a recent Swedish

549   study (Larsson et al., 2021) seems to have a very similar approach to the present study and to the
550   study of Faccoli & Stergulc (2008). They compared the number of attacked trees between control
551   sites and sites equipped with two types of traps (30 sites in 10 blocks repeated for 2 years). They
552   found high variability in attack levels between blocks and lower but not significant attack levels
553   in sites equipped with traps. However, these results seem so far to have been only published in a
554   working report in Swedish with a short English summary. It is therefore difficult to clearly
555   understand the methodology used and to make an informed comparison with the present results.

556   **Conclusion**
557   Overall, this study provided new insights into the efficacy of different management methods to
558   mitigate the damages caused by *Ips typographus* outbreaks. Our data does not support the use of
559   pheromone traps or tree-traps during spring as a complementary control method in previously
560   infested patches to improve the protection of trees in the vicinity of the initial infestation. The
561   use of baited crosstraps even appears hazardous and could increase the occurrence of new attacks
562   by attracting beetles but failing to neutralize them. The exact impact of sanitation felling on
563   damage reduction remains to be confirmed, but it likely contributed to the important decrease in
564   attacks globally observed in our experimental sites. Interestingly, our results differed from a
565   similar study on the impact of traps in reducing local damages. This highlights the importance of
566   the context in which each experiment is performed, and the necessity of repeating studies, with
567   an appropriate number of replicates and proper controls, before generalizing their conclusions.
568

References

Abgrall JF, Schvester D. 1987. Observations sur le piégeage de *Ips typographus* L. après chablis. *Revue Forestière Française*:359. DOI: 10.4267/2042/25808.

Alderweireld M, Burnay F, Pitchugin M, Lecomte H. 2015. Inventaire forestier wallon-Résultats 1994-2012. In: Jambes: SPW, DNF, 236 p.

Baier P, Pennerstorfer J, Schopf A. 2007. PHENIPS—A comprehensive phenology model of *Ips typographus* (L.) (Col., Scolytinae) as a tool for hazard rating of bark beetle infestation. *Forest Ecology and Management* 249:171–186. DOI: 10.1016/j.foreco.2007.05.020.

Bakke A. 1989. The recent *Ips typographus* outbreak in Norway - experiences from a control program. *Ecography* 12:515–519. DOI: 10.1111/j.1600-0587.1989.tb00930.x.

Bakke A. 1992. Monitoring bark beetle populations: effects of temperature. *Journal of Applied Entomology* 114:208–211. DOI: 10.1111/j.1439-0418.1992.tb01116.x.

Bakke A, Frøyen P, Skattebøl L. 1977. Field response to a new pheromonal compound isolated from *Ips typographus*. *Naturwissenschaften* 64:98–99.

Beudert B, Bässler C, Thorn S, Noss R, Schröder B, Dieffenbach-Fries H, Foullois N, Müller J. 2015. Bark beetles increase biodiversity while maintaining drinking water quality: bark beetles, biodiversity and drinking water. *Conservation Letters* 8:272–281. DOI: 10.1111/conl.12153.

Bjornstad ON. 2020. *ncf: spatial covariance functions.–R package ver. 1.2-9*.

Blaženec M, Majdák A, Jakuš R. 2021. Improvement of *Ips typographus* catches in pheromone trap barriers by altering of sex assigned pheromone blends. *Folia Oecologica* 48:25–34. DOI: 10.2478/foecol-2021-0003.

Bombosch S, Dedek W. 1994. Integrierter Pflanzenschutz gegen *Ips typographus* (L.) - Kombination von Pheromonen und dem systemischen Insektizid Methamidophos (IPIDEX) / Integrated pest control against *Ips typographus* (L.) - Combined use of pheromones and the systemic insecticide methamidophos (IPIDEX). *Zeitschrift für Pflanzenkrankheiten und Pflanzenschutz / Journal of Plant Diseases and Protection* 101:508–518.

Bretz F, Hothorn T, Westfall P, Westfall PH. 2010. *Multiple Comparisons Using R*. CRC Press.

Campbell SA, Borden JH. 2006. Close-range, in-flight integration of olfactory and visual information by a host-seeking bark beetle. Entomologia Experimentalis et Applicata 120:91–98. DOI: 10.1111/j.1570-7458.2006.00425.x.

Dobor L, Hlásny T, Zimová S. 2020. Contrasting vulnerability of monospecific and species-diverse forests to wind and bark beetle disturbance: The role of management. *Ecology and evolution* 10:12233–12245.

Dolezal P, Okrouhlik J, Davidkova M. 2016. Fine fluorescent powder marking study of dispersal in the spruce bark beetle, *Ips typographus* (Coleoptera: Scolytidae). *European Journal of Entomology* 113. DOI: 10.14411/eje.2016.001.

Drumont A, Gonzalez R, De Windt N, Grégoire J, De Proft M, Seutin E. 1992. Semiochemicals

608   and the integrated management of *Ips typographus* (L.)(Col., Scolytidae) in Belgium.
609   *Journal of applied entomology* 114:333–337.

610   Duelli P, Zahradnik P, Knizek M, Kalinova B. 1997. Migration in spruce bark beetles (*Ips*
611   *typographus* L.) and the efficiency of pheromone traps. *Journal of Applied Entomology*
612   121:297–303. DOI: 10.1111/j.1439-0418.1997.tb01409.x.

613   Ellerstrand SJ, Choudhury S, Svensson K, Andersson MN, Kirkeby C, Powell D, Schlyter F,
614   Jönsson AM, Brydegaard M, Hansson B, Runemark A. 2022. Weak population genetic
615   structure in Eurasian spruce bark beetle over large regional scales in Sweden. *Ecology*
616   *and Evolution* 12. DOI: 10.1002/ece3.9078.

617   Faccoli M, Stergulc F. 2008. Damage reduction and performance of mass trapping devices for
618   forest protection against the spruce bark beetle, *Ips typographus* (Coleoptera
619   Curculionidae Scolytinae). *Annals of Forest Science* 65:309. DOI:
620   10.1051/forest:2008010.

621   Fettig CJ, Hilszczański J. 2015. Management strategies for bark beetles in conifer forests. In:
622   *Bark Beetles*. Elsevier, 555–584. DOI: 10.1016/B978-0-12-417156-5.00014-9.

623   Fox J. 2002. *An R and S Plus Companion to Applied Regression*. Sage Publications, Inc.

624   Franklin AJ, Debruyne C, Gregoire J-C. 2000. Recapture of *Ips typographus* L. (Col.,
625   Scolytidae) with attractants of low release rates: localized dispersion and environmental
626   influences. *Agricultural and Forest Entomology* 2:259–270. DOI: 10.1046/j.1461-
627   9563.2000.00075.x.

628   Galko J, Nikolov C, Kunca A, Vakula J, Gubka A, Zúbrik M, Rell S, Konôpka B. 2016.
629   Effectiveness of pheromone traps for the European spruce bark beetle: a comparative
630   study of four commercial products and two new models. *Forestry Journal* 62:207–215.
631   DOI: 10.1515/forj-2016-0027.

632   Grégoire J-C, Evans HF. 2004. Damage and Control of Bawbilt Organisms an Overview. In:
633   Lieutier F, Day KR, Battisti A, Grégoire J-C, Evans HF eds. *Bark and Wood Boring*
634   *Insects in Living Trees in Europe, a Synthesis*. Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands, 19–37.
635   DOI: 10.1007/978-1-4020-2241-8_4.

636   Grégoire J-C, Nageleisen L-M. 2019. Une goutte d'eau hors de la mer ? Les piégeages de masse
637   face aux pullulations du typographe. *Forêt.Nature*:27–33.

638   Grégoire J-C, Raty L, Drumont A, De Windt N. 1997. Pheromone mass trapping: does it protect
639   windfalls from attack by *Ips typographus* L.(Coleoptera: Scolytidae). *Integrating*
640   *Cultural Tactics into the Management of Bark Beetle and Reforestation Pests, US For.*
641   *Serv. Gen. Tech. Rep., Radnor, PA*:1–8.

642   Griess VC, Acevedo R, Härtl F, Staupendahl K, Knoke T. 2012. Does mixing tree species
643   enhance stand resistance against natural hazards? A case study for spruce. *Forest Ecology*
644   *and Management* 267:284–296. DOI: 10.1016/j.foreco.2011.11.035.

645   Grodzki W. 2021. Do pheromone trapping always reflect *Ips typographus* (L.) population level?
646   A study from the Tatra National Park in Poland. *Folia Forestalia Polonica* 63:36–47.
647   DOI: 10.2478/ffp-2021-0004.

648 Grodzki W, Jakuš R, Lajzová E, Sitková Z, Maczka T, Škvarenina J. 2006. Effects of intensive
649   versus no management strategies during an outbreak of the bark beetle *Ips typographus*
650   (L.) (Col.: Curculionidae, Scolytinae) in the Tatra Mts. in Poland and Slovakia. *Annals of*
651   *Forest Science* 63:55–61. DOI: 10.1051/forest:2005097.

652 Havašová M, Ferenčík J, Jakuš R. 2017. Interactions between windthrow, bark beetles and forest
653   management in the Tatra national parks. *Forest Ecology and Management* 391:349–361.
654   DOI: 10.1016/j.foreco.2017.01.009.

655 Heber T, Helbig CE, Osmers S, Müller MG. 2021. Evaluation of attractant composition,
656   application rate, and trap type for potential mass trapping of *ips typographus* (l.). *Forests*
657   12:1727. DOI: 10.3390/f12121727.

658 Hlásny T, Krokene P, Liebhold A, Montagné-Huck C, Müller J, Qin H, Raffa K, Schelhaas M-J,
659   Seidl R, Svoboda M, Viiri H, European Forest Institute. 2019. *Living with bark beetles:*
660   *impacts, outlook and management options*. European Forest Institute. DOI:
661   10.36333/fs08.

662 Holuša J, Hlásny T, Modlinger R, Lukášová K, Kula E. 2017. Felled trap trees as the traditional
663   method for bark beetle control: Can the trapping performance be increased? *Forest*
664   *Ecology and Management* 404:165–173. DOI: 10.1016/j.foreco.2017.08.019.

665 Hothorn T, Bretz F, Westfall P. 2008. Simultaneous inference in general parametric models.
666   *Biometrical Journal: Journal of Mathematical Methods in Biosciences* 50:346–363.

667 Jactel H, Moreira X, Castagneyrol B. 2021. Tree Diversity and Forest Resistance to Insect Pests:
668   Patterns, Mechanisms, and Prospects. *Annual Review of Entomology* 66:277–296. DOI:
669   10.1146/annurev-ento-041720-075234.

670 Jactel H, Nicoll BC, Branco M, Gonzalez-Olabarria JR, Grodzki W, Långström B, Moreira F,
671   Netherer S, Orazio C, Piou D, Santos H, Schelhaas MJ, Tojic K, Vodde F. 2009. The
672   influences of forest stand management on biotic and abiotic risks of damage. *Annals of*
673   *Forest Science* 66:701–701. DOI: 10.1051/forest/2009054.

674 Jakuš R. 1998. A method for the protection of spruce stands against *Ips typographus* by the use
675   of barriers of pheromone traps in north-eastern Slovakia. *Anzeiger für Schädlingskunde*
676   *Pflanzenschutz Umweltschutz* 71:152–158. DOI: 10.1007/BF02769004.

677 Jakuš R. 2001. Bark beetle (Coleoptera, Scolytidae) outbreak and system of IPM measures in an
678   area affected by intensive forest decline connected with honey fungus (*Armillaria* sp.).
679   *Anzeiger für Schädlingskunde= Journal of pest science* 74:46–51.

680 Kärvemo S, Johansson V, Schroeder M, Ranius T. 2016. Local colonization-extinction dynamics
681   of a tree-killing bark beetle during a large-scale outbreak. *Ecosphere* 7:e01257.

682 Kautz M, Dworschak K, Gruppe A, Schopf R. 2011. Quantifying spatio-temporal dispersion of
683   bark beetle infestations in epidemic and non-epidemic conditions. *Forest Ecology and*
684   *Management* 262:598–608. DOI: 10.1016/j.foreco.2011.04.023.

685 Larsson P-E, Isacsson G, Rosenberg O, Weslien J-O, Örlander G. 2021. Projekt "Granbarkborre
686   2020" - granbarkborrefällors fångstförmåga och effekt på närliggande skog (Project
687   "Spruce bark beetle 2020" - spruce bark beetle traps – efficacy and effect on nearby

688   forest). *Sgogforsk*. 22 pp.

689   Lehnert LW, Bässler C, Brandl R, Burton PJ, Müller J. 2013. Conservation value of forests
690   attacked by bark beetles: Highest number of indicator species is found in early
691   successional stages. *Journal for Nature Conservation* 21:97–104. DOI:
692   10.1016/j.jnc.2012.11.003.

693   Lindmark M, Wallin EA, Jonsson B-G. 2022. Protecting forest edges using trap logs – Limited
694   effects of associated push-pull strategies targeting *Ips typographus*. *Forest Ecology and*
695   *Management* 505:119886. DOI: 10.1016/j.foreco.2021.119886.

696   Lobinger G, Skatulla U. 1996. Untersuchungen zum Einfluss von Sonnenlicht auf das
697   Schwärmverhalten von Borkenkäfern. *Anzeiger für Schädlingskunde, Pflanzenschutz,*
698   *Umweltschutz* 69:183–185.

699   Marini L, Ayres MP, Battisti A, Faccoli M. 2012. Climate affects severity and altitudinal
700   distribution of outbreaks in an eruptive bark beetle. *Climatic Change* 115:327–341. DOI:
701   10.1007/s10584-012-0463-z.

702   Marini L, Økland B, Jönsson AM, Bentz B, Carroll A, Forster B, Grégoire J-C, Hurling R,
703   Nageleisen LM, Netherer S, Ravn HP, Weed A, Schroeder M. 2017. Climate drivers of
704   bark beetle outbreak dynamics in Norway spruce forests. *Ecography* 40:1426–1435. DOI:
705   10.1111/ecog.02769.

706   Mezei P. 2017. Influence of different forest protection strategies on spruce tree mortality during
707   a bark beetle outbreak. *Annals of Forest Science*:12.

708   Mezei P, Jakuš R, Pennerstorfer J, Havašová M, Škvarenina J, Ferenčík J, Slivinský J, Bičárová
709   S, Bilčík D, Blaženec M, Netherer S. 2017. Storms, temperature maxima and the
710   Eurasian spruce bark beetle *Ips typographus*—An infernal trio in Norway spruce forests
711   of the Central European High Tatra Mountains. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology*
712   242:85–95. DOI: 10.1016/j.agrformet.2017.04.004.

713   Miścicki S, Grodzki W. 2021. Can sanitation cutting contribute to reduced mortality of Norway
714   spruce *Picea abies* (L.) H. Karst., due to infestation by *Ips typographus* (L.)? *Sylwan 165*
715   *(11): 749-762*. DOI: 10.26202/SYLWAN.2021105.

716   Mogil JS, Macleod MR. 2017. No publication without confirmation. *Nature News* 542:409. DOI:
717   10.1038/542409a.

718   Møller AP, Jennions MD. 2001. Testing and adjusting for publication bias. *Trends in Ecology &*
719   *Evolution* 16:580–586. DOI: 10.1016/S0169-5347(01)02235-2.

720   Müller J, Bußler H, Goßner M, Rettelbach T, Duelli P. 2008. The European spruce bark beetle
721   *Ips typographus* in a national park: from pest to keystone species. *Biodiversity and*
722   *Conservation* 17:2979–3001. DOI: 10.1007/s10531-008-9409-1.

723   Müller M, Niesar M, Berens I, Gailing O. 2022. Genotyping by sequencing reveals lack of local
724   genetic structure between two German *Ips typographus* L. populations. *Forestry*
725   *Research* 2:1–5. DOI: 10.48130/FR-2022-0001.

726   OWSF. 2018. *La lettre d'info de l'OWSF*. Observatoire Wallon de la Santé des Forêts.
727   OWSF. 2021. *La lettre d'info de l'OWSF*. Observatoire Wallon de la Santé des Forêts.

728 Petit S, Claessens H, Vincke C, Ponette Q, Marchal D. 2017. Le Fichier écologique des essences,
729   version 2.0. *Forêt. Nature*:12–19.
730 Pfeil W. 1827. *Über Insektenschaden in den Wäldern, die Mittel ihm vorzubeugen und seine*
731   *Nachteile zu vermindern*. Berlin: Verlag Boicke.
732 Pfister A, Hueber W. 2008. Eignung von Pheromonfallen zur Borkenkäferbekämpfung im
733   fünfjährigen Dauerversuch. *Forstschutz Aktuell* 43:7–11.
734 Potterf M, Nikolov C, Kočická E, Ferenčík J, Mezei P, Jakuš R. 2019. Landscape-level spread of
735   beetle infestations from windthrown- and beetle-killed trees in the non-intervention zone
736   of the Tatra National Park, Slovakia (Central Europe). *Forest Ecology and Management*
737   432:489–500. DOI: 10.1016/j.foreco.2018.09.050.
738 R Core Team. 2022. *R: A language and environment for statistical computing*. Vienna, Austria.
739 Raty L, Drumont A, De Windt N, Grégoire J-C. 1995. Mass trapping of the spruce bark beetle
740   *Ips typographus* L.: traps or trap trees? *Forest Ecology and Management* 78:191–205.
741   DOI: 10.1016/0378-1127(95)03582-1.
742 Saint-Germain M, Buddle CM, Drapeau P. 2007. Primary attraction and random landing in host-
743   selection by wood-feeding insects: a matter of scale? *Agricultural and Forest*
744   *Entomology* 9:227–235. DOI: 10.1111/j.1461-9563.2007.00337.x.
745 Schroeder LM, Lindelöw A. 2002. Attacks on living spruce trees by the bark beetle *Ips*
746   *typographus* (Col. Scolytidae) following a storm-felling: a comparison between stands
747   with and without removal of wind-felled trees. *Agricultural and Forest Entomology*
748   4:47–56. DOI: 10.1046/j.1461-9563.2002.00122.x.
749 Seynave I, Gégout J-C, Hervé J-C, Drapier J, Bruno É, Dumé G. 2005. *Picea abies* site index
750   prediction by environmental factors and understorey vegetation: a two-scale approach
751   based on survey databases. *Canadian Journal of Forest Research* 35:1669–1678. DOI:
752   10.1139/X05-088.
753 Stadelmann G, Bugmann H, Meier F, Wermelinger B, Bigler C. 2013. Effects of salvage logging
754   and sanitation felling on bark beetle (*Ips typographus* L.) infestations. *Forest Ecology*
755   *and Management* 305:273–281. DOI: 10.1016/j.foreco.2013.06.003.
756 Valeria M, Coralie B, Petr D, Susanne K, Jan O, Christian S, Yoshan M. 2016. How differential
757   management strategies affect *Ips typographus* L. dispersal. *Forest Ecology and*
758   *Management* 360:195–204. DOI: 10.1016/j.foreco.2015.10.037.
759 Vanická H, Holuša J, Resnerová K, Ferenčík J, Potterf M, Véle A, Grodzki W. 2020.
760   Interventions have limited effects on the population dynamics of *Ips typographus* and its
761   natural enemies in the Western Carpathians (Central Europe). *Forest Ecology and*
762   *Management* 470–471:118209. DOI: 10.1016/j.foreco.2020.118209.
763 Vité JP. 1989. The European struggle to control *Ips typographus* - past, present and future.
764   *Ecography* 12:520–525. DOI: 10.1111/j.1600-0587.1989.tb00931.x.
765 Wermelinger B. 2004. Ecology and management of the spruce bark beetle *Ips typographus*—a
766   review of recent research. *Forest Ecology and Management* 202:67–82. DOI:
767   10.1016/j.foreco.2004.07.018.

768 Wermelinger B, Seifert M. 1999. Temperature-dependent reproduction of the spruce bark beetle
769   *Ips typographus*, and analysis of the potential population growth. *Ecological Entomology*
770   24:103–110. DOI: 10.1046/j.1365-2311.1999.00175.x.
771 Weslien J. 1992. Effects of mass trapping on *Ips typographus* (L.) populations. *Journal of*
772   *Applied Entomology* 114:228–232. DOI: 10.1111/j.1439-0418.1992.tb01120.x.
773 Weslien J, Lindelöw Å. 1989. Trapping a local population of spruce bark beetles *Ips*
774   *typographus* (L.): Population size and origin of trapped beetles. *Ecography* 12:511–514.
775   DOI: 10.1111/j.1600-0587.1989.tb00929.x.
776 Weslien J, Lindelöw Å. 1990. Recapture of marked spruce bark beetles (*Ips typographus*) in
777   pheromone traps using area-wide mass trapping. *Canadian Journal of Forest Research*
778   20:1786–1790.
779 Wichmann L, Ravn HP. 2001. The spread of *Ips typographus* (L.) (Coleoptera, Scolytidae)
780   attacks following heavy windthrow in Denmark, analysed using GIS. *Forest Ecology and*
781   *Management* 148:31–39. DOI: 10.1016/S0378-1127(00)00477-1.
782 Zhang Q-H, Jakus R, Schlyter F, Birgersson G. 2003. Can *Ips typographus* (L.) (Col.,
783   Scolytidae) smell the carrion odours of the dead beetles in pheromone traps?
784   Electrophysiological analysis. *Journal of Applied Entomology* 127:185–188. DOI:
785   10.1046/j.1439-0418.2003.00748.x.
786 Zolubas P, Byers JA. 1995. Recapture of dispersing bark beetle *Ips typographus* L. (Col.,
787   Scolytidae) in pheromone-baited traps: regression models. *Journal of Applied*
788   *Entomology* 119:285–289. DOI: 10.1111/j.1439-0418.1995.tb01287.x.
789 Zuur AF, Ieno EN, Smith GM. 2007. *Analysing ecological data*. Springer.

790 Aknowledgements

791 We thank many persons for their valuable help during this project: Many forest officers from the
792 Walloon Forest administration (DNF), L. Sagehomme and the staff from the CRA-W
793 entomology lab for field data collection and their help in the set-up of experimental devices; M.
794 Deproft (CRA-W), D. Jacques and D. Arnould (DNF) for launching this project and for
795 stimulating discussions about the results; J.C. Grégoire (ULB) and Q. Leroy (DEMNA-OWSF)
796 for useful input on the project and C. Lucau-Danila (CRA-W) for GPS data cleaning. We also
797 would like to thank Reviewers for taking the necessary time and effort to review the manuscript.

Analysis of variance table for the Gaussian Linear Model with volume of new attacks as response (log(x+1) transformed).

Spruce area and Initial volume are square root transformed and centered on their mean.

1 **Table 1: Analysis of variance table for the Gaussian Linear Model with volume of new attacks as response**
2 **(log(x+1) transformed).** Spruce area and Initial volume are square root transformed and centered on their mean.

	Sum Sq	Df	F value	P-value
Treatment	11.928	2	2.738	0.069
Year	1.393	1	0.640	0.425
Treatment x Year	16.830	2	3.863	0.024
Spruce area within 100m	5.268	1	2.419	0.123
Initial volume attacked	3.907	1	1.794	0.183
Residuals	252.655	116	-	-

Analysis of Deviance table (Likelihood Ratio – LR – tests) for the binomial GLM with presence/absence of new attacks as response.

Spruce area and Initial volume are square root transformed and centered on their mean.

1 **Table 2: Analysis of Deviance table (Likelihood Ratio – LR – tests) for the binomial GLM with**
2 **presence/absence of new attacks as response.** Spruce area and Initial volume are square root transformed and
3 centered on their mean.

	LR	Df	P-value
Treatment	8.568	2	0.014
Year	0.094	1	0.759
Treatment x Year	1.321	2	0.517
Spruce area within 100m	7.952	1	0.005
Initial volume attacked	1.576	1	0.209

Figure 1

Distribution of the sites for each treatment.

The administrative units drawn on the map correspond to public forest management districts.

Figure 2

Illustration of experimental devices.

(A) Crosstraps device. (B) Treetrap device.

Figure 3

Comparison of the wood volume of new attacks relative to their distance from the initial patch in 2020.

Each gray line represents the volume attacked in one site in 2020 at different distances from the initial patch (Initial = volume attacked during the previous year i.e. 2019). The red line represents the average value. The new attacks tend to be concentrated close to the initial attack from the previous year. The attacks between 0-50 m and 50-100 m have been pooled in the final analyses (see Fig. 4).

Figure 4

Comparison of the wood volumes attacked during the previous year (Initial) and the new attacks between 0 and 100 m from the center of the initial patch.

Each gray line represents one site and the red lines correspond to the average values. There is a strong decrease of the volume attacked even in the control sites without traps.

Figure 5

Comparison of the wood volumes of new attacks between treatments for each year.

The dark circles and error bars represent the linear model predictions and their 95% Confidence Intervals. The gray circles represent the observed values. The letters summarize the post-hoc all pairwise comparisons : different letters indicate a significant difference (after p-value correction for multiple testing). These comparisons are valid only within a year. The volumes of new attacks were higher in crosstraps sites relative to the control sites but only in 2020.

Figure 6

Comparison of the proportion of sites with new attacks between treatments.

The dark circles and error bars represent the binomial GLM predictions and their 95% Confidence Intervals. The gray circles represent the observed values (here: presence/absence of new attacks + random noise to limit over-plotting). The results were pooled for both years because of the absence of year x treatment interaction. The letters summarize the post-hoc all pairwise comparisons: different letters indicate a significant difference (after p-value correction for multiple testing). The proportion of sites with new attacks is higher for crosstrap sites compared to tree-trap sites.