

# This item is the archived peer-reviewed author-version of:

Simplified modelling enhances biocontrol decision making in tomato greenhouses for three important pest species

## **Reference:**

Moerkens Rob, Janssen D., Brenard Nathalie, Reybroeck Eva, del Mar Tellez Maria, Rodríguez Estefania, Bosmans L., Leirs Herwig, Sluydts Vincent.-Simplified modelling enhances biocontrol decision making in tomato greenhouses for three important pest species Journal of pest science - ISSN 1612-4758 - Heidelberg, Springer heidelberg, 2020, p. 1-11 Full text (Publisher's DOI): https://doi.org/10.1007/S10340-020-01256-0 To cite this reference: https://hdl.handle.net/10067/1699100151162165141

uantwerpen.be

Institutional repository IRUA

# 1 Simplified modelling enhances biocontrol decision making in tomato

## 2 greenhouses for three important pest species

- 3 Moerkens R<sup>1,2,5</sup>, Janssen D<sup>4</sup>, Brenard N<sup>2</sup>, Eva Reybroeck<sup>3</sup>, Maria del Mar Tellez<sup>4</sup>, Estefania Rodríguez<sup>4</sup>,
- 4 Bosmans L<sup>1</sup>, Leirs H<sup>2</sup>, Sluydts V.<sup>2</sup>
- 5 <sup>1</sup>Research Centre Hoogstraten, Voort 71, 2328 Hoogstraten, Belgium
- 6 <sup>2</sup>Evolutionary Ecology Group, University of Antwerp, Universiteitsplein 1, 2610 Wilrijk, Belgium
- 7 <sup>3</sup>Research Station for Vegetable Production, Duffelsesteenweg 101, 2860 Sint-Katelijne-Waver, Belgium
- 8 <sup>4</sup>IFAPA, Centro La Mojonera, Camino de San Nicolas 1, 04745 La Mojonera, Spain.
- 9 <sup>5</sup>Biobest Group N.V., Ilse Velden 18, 2260 Westerlo, Belgium
- 10
- 11 Corresponding author: Rob Moerkens, Research Centre Hoogstraten, Voort 71, 2328 Hoogstraten,
- 12 Belgium. <u>Rob.moerkens@biobestgroup.com</u>tel: 0032 14 25 79 80. ORCID: 0000-0002-9882-9313

13

## 14 Acknowledgements

The Agency Flanders Innovation & Entrepreneurship (VLAIO) financed this study. The research Project 140948 was granted to Research Centre Hoogstraten (R. Moerkens, L. Bosmans) in cooperation with Research Station for Vegetable Production (E. Reybroeck) and the University of Antwerp (V. Sluydts, H. Leirs). A second VLAIO project (160427) expanded the previous consortium with the Andalusian Institute for Research and Training in Agriculture and Fishery (APCIN2016-00034-00-00) (D. Janssen) and Wageningen University and Research. There is no conflict of interest.

21

## 22 Keywords

- 23 Bemisia tabaci, biocontrol, Macrolophus pygmaeus, Nesidiocoris tenuis, Phytoseiulus persimilis,
- 24 Tetranychus urticae, Trialeurodes vaporariorum

# 25 Key message

26	•	Generalist and specialist beneficials are used in greenhouse crops to control pests.
27	•	Predator-prey population models can be used to predict pest outbreaks and prevent pesticide
28		applications. Currently, no such models are on the market for decision making.
29	•	Simple, logistic regression models were built for three economic important pests and their
30		predators in tomato crops.
31	•	The predicted population dynamics are in line with generalist and specialist predator ecology
32	•	The models were validated and deemed satisfactory for practical guidance in biocontrol
33		actions.
34		

# 35 Author's contributions

36	RM, NB, HL and VS conceived the ideas and designed methodology; RM, DJ, MMT, ER, RE and LB
37	collected the data; RM and VS analysed the data; RM led the writing of the manuscript. All authors
38	contributed critically to the drafts and gave final approval for publication.
39	
40	
41	
42	
43	
44	
45	
46	
47	

## 48 Abstract

Generalist and specialist predators are successfully used in biocontrol programs in greenhouse vegetable crops, like tomato. A greenhouse ecosystem is rather simple and provides an excellent opportunity for developing predator-prey decision models. Three systems were selected, 1) the generalist predatory bug *Macrolophus pygmaeus* and the greenhouse whitefly *Trialeurodes vaporariorum*, 2) the generalist predatory bug *Nesidiocoris tenuis* and the tobacco whitefly Bemisia *tabaci* and 3) the specialist predatory mite *Phytoseiulus persimilis* and the spider mite *Tetranychus urticae*. The study is based on an extensive field dataset.

No complex mathematical predator-prey models were developed. A binomial variable was given the value of "0" for the period when the pest was not under control. As soon as the population declined after the peak density, this variable was given a value of "1". The relationship between the densities of the prey and the predator was checked using a logistic regression model.

The validated models do not calculate future pest densities but rather predict when pest control should be initiated, based on the number of pests and predators present at a certain time. Numerical simulation of the prey isoclines showed an L-shaped curve for the generalist predators and a linear curve for the specialist predators.

Our simple, empirical modelling approach provides satisfactory models for biocontrol purposes. When combined with a standardized monitoring protocol, these models can be implemented in decision tools. In the future, more data will allow a machine learning approach, in which additional parameters like temperature, humidity, time can be included.

- 68
- 69
- 70
- 71
- 72

-3-

## 73 Introduction

The preventative release of generalist predators as biocontrol agents in IPM programs has become common practice in European greenhouse vegetable crops as they can develop and build up a strong standing army in absence of the target pest (e.g. Nomikou et al. 2002; Messelink and Janssen, 2014; Moerkens et al., 2017; Brenard et al. 2018). Specialist predators (or parasitoids) are released more curatively to target specific pests (e.g. Van Lenteren et al. 1996; Alatawi et al. 2011).

79 A big advantage of a greenhouse ecosystem compared to open, natural conditions is its simplicity. 80 A Northwestern European greenhouse can be considered as a closed ecosystem with very few 81 movements to the surrounding area (in comparison with open fields). The vegetation/crop is a 82 monoculture and the number of prey and predator species is small, during some periods even limited 83 to one predator and one pest. Such one-to-one predator-prey interactions are rare in natural 84 conditions. The simplicity of ecosystems in greenhouses allows more controlled ecological studies of a 85 few species. Nevertheless, one or two pest species combined with one or more generalist or specialist 86 predators can result in complex population dynamics. Greater insight into these dynamics would allow 87 a better interpretation of the predator-prey interactions in the field and would improve biocontrol 88 strategies.

89 The classic population model is a Lotka-Volterra predator-prey model (Gause et al. 1936). 90 Models that are more complex have been proposed (e.g. Hanski et al., 1991; Turchin and Hanski, 1997; 91 Hanski et al. 2001; Mukhopadhyay and Bhattacharyya 2013). These models are very theoretical and 92 try to convert several biological interactions in a mathematical formula. The drawback is their 93 complexity when more parameters are included. Validation with extended field data on different 94 locations is missing. A good example of this is the well-studied predatory mite Phytoseiulus persimilis 95 (Athias-Henriot) (Acari: Phytoseiidae) and its prey, two-spotted spider mite Tetranychus urticae (Koch) 96 (Acari: Tetranychidae). Several predator-prey models have been developed in the past (Bernstein 97 1985; Bancroft and Margolies, 1999; Kozlova et al. 2005; Kuang et al. 2017), but validation in practical 98 conditions is missing. E.g. Kozlova et al. (2005) describes a deterministic model with diffusion and time

-4-

99 delay, which gave a reasonably good fit to the field data. The goal of their study was not to describe 100 the data but to determine the parameters and the type of behavior that takes place in the particular 101 system of prey and predator. For biocontrol purposes, it is sufficient to know the prey isocline (i.e. how 102 many predators are needed to control the prey) in combination with the probability of a pest 103 population being under control or not at a given point in time, which is the scope of our study.

104 In this study, three predator-prey systems (i.e. simplified systems with just one predator and only 105 one of its prey species) which are common in tomato greenhouses were selected. The first predator-106 prey system is the predatory bug Macrolophus pygmaeus (Rambur) (Hemiptera: Miridae) and the 107 greenhouse whitefly Trialeurodes vaporariorum (Westwood) (Hemiptera: Aleyrodidae). Macrolophus 108 pygmaeus is a zoophytophagous generalist predator, which is capable of controlling several pest 109 species like whiteflies, aphids, mites, thrips and Lepidoptera (e.g. Enkegaard et al. 2001; Perdikis and 110 Lykouressis, 2002; Blaeser et al. 2004; Castañé et al. 2004; Alomar et al. 2006; Urbaneja et al. 2009). It 111 can maintain its population by feeding on the plant while prey densities are low or absent (e.g. Perdikis 112 and Lykouressis, 2000; Ingegno et al. 2011). Population growth is accelerated when supplementary 113 food is provided after inoculative release in the crop (Moerkens et al., 2017; Brenard et al. 2018, 2019). 114 The second predator-prey system is the predatory bug Nesidiocoris tenuis (Reuter) (Hemiptera: 115 Miridae) and the tobacco whitefly Bemisia tabaci (Gennadius) (Hemiptera: Aleyrodidae), with a similar 116 interaction as between M. pygmaeus and T. vaporariorum. Nesidiocoris tenuis is also a 117 zoophytophagous generalist predator and is mostly released in South-European (Spain, Canary Islands, 118 Sicily) tomato greenhouses as a biocontrol agent against B. tabaci (Carnero et al. 2000; Calvo et al. 119 2012; Calvo et al. 2012) and Tuta absoluta (Meyrick) (Lepidoptera: Gelechiidae) (Urbaneja et al. 2009; 120 Calvo et al 2012b; Urbaneja et al. 2012).

121 The third predator-prey system is the predatory mite *P. persimilis* and the two-spotted spider 122 mite, *T. urticae*. *Phytoseiulus persimilis* is a specialized feeder of spider mites and is commonly released 123 as a biocontrol agent (e.g. Gough, 1991; Drukker et al. 1997; Opit et al. 2004).

-5-

The population dynamics of these three predator-prey interactions in tomato greenhouses were simplified and simulated using a common logistic regression with the intention to predict a probability of control of the pest, based on the number of predators and prey at a certain time. The prey isoclines were computed numerically and compared between two generalist predators (*M. pygmaeus and N. tenuis*) and a specialist predator (*P. persimilis*).

129

## 130 Materials and Methods

#### 131 Data collection

#### 132 Predator-prey model: M. pygmaeus - T. vaporariorum

Population dynamics were recorded in seven experimental greenhouse compartments (size between 500 and 1500m<sup>2</sup>) during several years (2016-2018) at Research Centre Hoogstraten (Belgium) and at eight commercial, Belgian tomato greenhouses with a minimum of four hectares per greenhouse. The different locations had a wide diversity of different tomato varieties (beef, cluster and specialty tomatoes) each with their own climate conditions. Tomato plants are cultivated year round in Belgium with artificially lit and non-lit crops (Moerkens et al. 2016). More details on the different locations are described in Table 1.

140 The number of adult whiteflies and adult mirids were counted on yellow sticky traps (YSTs) (e.g. 141 Bug-scan Dry, Biobest, Belgium), which is a common monitoring method in tomato greenhouses (Böckmann et al. 2015; Pinto-Zevallos and Vänninen, 2013). These traps (25 x 10 cm) were hung just 142 143 below the head of the plant on 185 fixed locations distributed throughout the different monitored 144 greenhouses. Every week or maximum two weeks, the population densities of predator and prey were 145 manually counted on all 185 YSTs. The YSTs were replaced during every sampling occasion. 146 Macrolophus pygmaeus densities on YSTs are much lower compared to whiteflies and can vary a lot in 147 time and between locations (unpublished observations). Therefore, mirid densities were counted on

-6-

two sides of the YST (whiteflies only on one side) and were averaged over a minimum of four YST's.
These four YSTs were located in the same plant row (at commercial greenhouses) or in the same greenhouse compartment (at Research Centre Hoogstraten). Thus, at each time point, a minimum of four (eight sides) averaged YST counts were used for *M. pygmaeus*. This way variation in mirid counts was minimized. In total, 2730 unique predator-prey combinations were collected, divided over multiple greenhouses and time points. The total dataset contains a wide range of predator/prey ratios, including extreme values during pest outbreaks.

Macrolophus pygmaeus individuals were released at the start of each new crop cycle. The total number, the distribution and the feeding strategy differs between growers, as they work with different producers (e.g. Biobest Group N.V., Belgium and Koppert N.V., the Netherlands). A common release strategy is described by Moerkens et al. (2017). The whitefly populations naturally persist and disperse each cropping season, no extra releases were carried out. Periods when growers applied plant protection products or periods when secondary pests (e.g. *T. absoluta, A. lycopersici* and *T. urticae*), occurred were removed from the datasets in order to obtain one to one predator-prey interactions.

162

163 Predator-prey model: N. tenuis – B. tabaci

Population dynamics were recorded at four commercial tomato greenhouses in the Almeria provinceof Spain in 2018, each with a different climate condition. More details are presented in Table 1.

The sampling method was identical to the one described above. Also for *N. tenuis* an average density for each sampled tomato row was calculated (10 YST sides). Every two weeks, the population densities were counted on 80 YSTs at fixed locations in the greenhouses. In total, 1220 unique YSTs were sampled. The total dataset contained a wide range of predator/prey ratios, including extreme values during pest outbreaks.

Like *M. pygmaeus, N. tenuis* individuals are released in a similar way at the start of each crop cycle and
whitefly populations naturally persist and disperse each cropping season. Again, periods when growers
applied plant protection products or periods when secondary pests occurred were omitted.

-7-

174

#### 175 Predator-prey model: P. persimilis – T. urticae

176 All data were obtained at Research Centre Hoogstraten, Hoogstraten, Belgium. During two subsequent 177 cropping seasons in 2016 and 2017, tomatoes were planted in two different semi-commercial 178 greenhouses of 200m<sup>2</sup> in January 2016 and 2017 (Table 1). Crawling insects, like mites, require a 179 different sampling approach compared to flying insects. Mites cannot be monitored using YSTs and 180 require sampling on the plant. In 2016, 252 plants were monitored weekly between 11 May 2016 and 181 29 June 2016. In 2017, 476 plants were sampled weekly between 21 March 2017 and 6 June 2017. In 182 total, there were 600 plants present in each greenhouse compartment. Every week, the number of 183 adult T. urticae and P. persimilis were counted with the naked eye on the fourth leaf starting from the 184 head of the plant. From previous experience, we know that the third to the fifth leaves hold the most 185 spider mites (unpublished observations). Spider mites were released on 30 March in 2016 and 7 March 186 in 2017. Tomato leaves infested with T. urticae were randomly distributed in the greenhouse, which 187 resulted in hotspots of spider mites and plants with less spider mites. The predatory mite P. persimilis 188 (Phytoseiulus-System, Biobest Group N.V., Westerlo, Belgium) was homogenously released at a dose 189 of 20 ind/m<sup>2</sup> in the head of each plant on 12 May in 2016 and 21 April 2017. The predatory bug M. 190 pygmaeus was not released in these greenhouses. The number of whiteflies remained very low during 191 the 8 and 11 week interval in 2016 and 2017 respectively. Only a few individuals were spotted by the 192 end of the experiment. Therefore, spider mites and P. persimilis were the only pest and predator of 193 significance present in the greenhouse.

194

#### 195 Logistic regression model

The population dynamics of the different predators and prey are typically characterized by a strong population growth of the prey, followed by that of the predator (Fig 1). Sometimes, the pest outbreak was too severe and the grower decided to use a chemical plant protection product. As mentioned earlier, the data were cut off at these moments and not considered for further analysis. For the logistic models, a variable "pest control" was created. This binomial variable was given the value of "0" for the period when the pest densities were increasing. As soon as the population declined after the peak density, the pest control variable was given a value of "1". This variable was created manually for each YST (flying insects) or plant (crawling insects) time series. If population densities were very low or confusing and no clear "0" or "1" value could be given, the data were omitted from the dataset. All datasets are independent between years and growers (Table 1.).

206 We quantified through a generalized linear model (glm) how the variable pest control yes (1) or no (0) 207 changed in relation to the previous densities of the predator and the pest. This logistic regression was 208 built with a binomial distribution and logit link function. The number of insects on the YSTs and the 209 number of mites on the leaves were log transformed (log + 1) prior to the regression analyses. The 210 statistical analysis started with a saturated model and interactions and non-significant main factors 211 were dropped at a significance level of 0.05. Predicted probabilities from this logistic regression model were converted to their original state using the inverse logit formulae (exp<sup>model parameters</sup>/(1 + exp<sup>model</sup> 212 213 <sup>parameters</sup>). All statistics were carried out in R v.3.5.1 (R Core Team, 2018). The used model input datasets 214 are indicated in Table 1.

215

#### 216 Model validation

The logistic regression model enables us to predict the probability of biocontrol at given pest and predator densities. In order to validate the model, the predictions of the model were compared to the observations of an independent dataset. The datasets used for model validation are marked in Table 1. The output of the model is a probability (between 0 and 1), while the observed data consists of values of either 0 or 1 (no/yes control). Therefore, the model output probability was rounded to 0.10 and grouped together according to the following categories: (0.10, 0.20, 0.30, 0.40, 0.50, 0.60, 0.70, 0.80, 0.90, and 1.00). For each category, the proportion of samples with actual, observed biocontrol (value 1) was determined. This way, we can compare the model output, which is a chance of biocontrol with the actual, observed proportion of biocontrol. Frans et al. (2018) describe a similar method for internal fruit rot in bell pepper. The slope and intercept of the regressions lines between observed and estimated proportions were checked whether they differed from unity and zero, respectively. All statistics were carried out in R v.3.5.1 (R Core Team, 2018).

229

#### 230 Calculation of prey isoclines

231 Simulation of prey isoclines requires calculation of a curve, along which the prey population neither 232 grows nor declines as a function of the predator population. These are the points in time series of 233 pest/prey densities where this series reaches its maximum. In order to use a logistic regression model, 234 we have categorized the increasing phase of the pest densities as "0" and the decreasing phase, 235 including the maximum, as "1" as illustrated in Figure 1. Therefore, the model will predict whether the pest population will increase (0) or decrease (1). The output of this model is not "0" or "1" but a 236 237 probability between "0" and "1". To determine the point of maximum pest density (i.e. data point on 238 the pest isocline) we need to determine the required density of predators. This was achieved by 239 numerically changing the predator density values for a range of prey densities until the model output 240 reached a chance of 50%. The prey isocline was defined as a curve where the prey population had 50% 241 chance of increasing or decreasing, which is similar to the classic definition of a curve along which the 242 prey population neither grows nor declines. Above this curve, the pest population has a higher chance 243 to decrease and below this curve the pest population has a higher chance to increase. In addition, curves that mark when the pest population has a 25% and 75% chance of increasing were added to the 244 245 plots..

246

-10-

## 247 Results

#### 248 Data collection

As an illustration of the datasets, the total averaged population densities of predator and prey are given in Fig. 1. After removing zero values (prey) and unusable data (unclear "0" and "1" values), 1829 and 967 data points were usable for the *M. pygmaeus – T. vaporariorum* model for the model input and validation respectively. For the *N. tenuis – B. tabaci* model 319 and 527 data points remained and for *P. persimilis – T. urticae* 2016 and 1832 data points.

254

#### 255 Logistic regression model

The interaction effect between the densities of the predator and prey was dropped from the model for both *M. pygmaeus* – *T. vaporariorum* (glm: z = -0.283: p = 0.777) and *N. tenuis* – *B. tabaci* (glm: z =-0.366; P = 0.714). The additive effect of the predator and the prey were highly significant for both predator-prey models (P < 0.05). For *P. persimilis* – *T. urticae*, the saturated model was significantly better than simplified ones. All statistical details can be found in Table 2.

261

#### 262 Model validation

The relations between the observed and estimated chances of biocontrol were checked with a linear regression. The slope and the intercept of this regression for the *M. pygmaeus – T. vaporariorum* model tested not significantly different from unity (t = -1.926; P = 0.090) and zero (t = -0.539; P = 0.605) respectively (Fig. 2). Likewise, the slope and the intercept for the *N. tenuis – B. tabaci* model tested not significantly different from unity (t = -0.131; P = 0.899) and zero (t = 0.965; P = 0.363) respectively (Fig. 2). Similar results were found for the *P. persimilis – T. urticae* model for the slope (t = -0.592; P =

-11-

0.580) and the intercept (t = -0.233; P= 0.825) (Figure 2). One outlier was removed from the dataset at
the estimated chance for biocontrol of 0.60 because of low sample size (n = 23). Overall, the values on
the x-axis (observed) are equal to the values on the y-axis (estimated) for all three predator-prey
models.

273

#### 274 Calculation of prey isoclines

The prey isoclines of the whiteflies have an L-shape in relation to their generalist predators (Fig. 3). At low prey densities (for *T. vaporariorum* < 100 and *B. tabaci* < 30), more mirids are needed to control the pest population. *N. tenuis* is able to control *B. tabaci* at lower densities on the yellow sticky trap compared to *M. pygmaeus* and *T. vaporariorum*. However, the catch rate on the yellow sticky trap can be different for the different species. Therefore, the densities can be biased, which makes comparison between species difficult.

The specialist *P. persimilis* has a more linear/horizontal relationship with his prey (Fig. 3). More *P. persimilis* is needed at increasing spider mite densities. An observation of only one adult *P. persimilis* per leaf is sufficient to reduce the spider mite population almost independent of the pest density.

Prey isoclines with a probability of 0.25 and 0.75 are shown in Fig. 3. Above the prey isocline, the prey
population has a higher tendency to decrease. Below the prey isocline, the pest population will most
likely increase.

287

## 288 Discussion

289 Monocultures in greenhouse crops provide a perfect semi-natural environment for studying 290 population dynamics of different predators and their prey. In comparison to natural ecosystems with 291 a multitude of variables, greenhouses are simple, semi-enclosed ecosystems, wherein even climate 292 conditions are standardized within specific boundaries for crop cultivation. Data collection of one-to-

-12-

one predator-prey systems in tomato greenhouses provided a large database of three study systems:
 *M. pygmaeus – T. vaporariorum, N. tenuis – B. tabaci* and *P. persimilis – T. urticae.* For each predator prey system a logistic regression model was fitted and validated based on field data collected at semi commercial and commercial companies. We do not predict population densities, but the probability
 of being in the increase or decrease phase of the pest population, given the population sizes of prey
 and predators.

299 Generalist and specialist predators interact in a different way with their prey. When prey is 300 scarce, a generalist predator will add alternative prey or food sources to their diet diet(Křivan1996, 301 Turchin and Hanski 1997; Hanski et al. 2001; van Baalen et al. 2001; Symondson et al. 2002; 302 Mukhopadhyay and Bhattacharyya 2013). For both M. pygmaeus and N. tenuis and their prey, an L-303 shaped prey isocline was simulated based on our rather simple logistic regression model (Fig. 3). Such 304 an L-shaped isocline was previously described as a prey refuge (Křivan, 2011; Křivan and Priyadarshi 305 2015). This means that a part of the prey population was inaccessible for the predator. Such an L-shape 306 is not illogical for a generalist predator as they will add alternative prey or food sources (i.e. tomato 307 fruit/leaves) to their diet when the prey becomes scarce. Thus, at low prey densities, much higher 308 predator densities are required to control the pest. Mirids, like M. pygmaeus and N. tenuis, always 309 require plant food in their diet for water and nutrient uptake (Moerkens et al. 2016; Urbaneja-Bernat 310 et al. 2019). They can also survive on the plant when prey is absent or scarce (e.g. Perdikis and 311 Lykouressis, 2000; Ingegno et al. 2011). In fact, the L-shape can be considered as a lack of encounter 312 rates between predator and prey and/or limited searching efficiency of the predator. A prey would not 313 go extinct very quickly in combination with a generalist predator, as they ideally reach a stable 314 equilibrium point. Our model does not allow prediction of the predator isocline or calculations of 315 equilibrium points. However, Figure 1 illustrates that both predator and prey densities remain within an 316 acceptable range (based on personal communication with the growers) after the pest population peak for both 317 *M. pygmaeus* and *N. tenuis*. At very high prey densities the carrying capacity of the environment/crop 318 will theoretically limit the reproduction of the prey and less predators will be required to reduce the

pest population. Such prey isoclines are characterized by a "hump". The classic example of such a model is the Rosenzweig-MacArthur model (Rosenzweig and MacArthur 1963). The combination of such a model with a "prey refuge" was described by Křivan (2011) and Křivan and Priyadarshi (2015). Such a "hump" was not detected in the data, although the prey isocline has a slow decline at high prey densities. In other words, at increasing pest densities, less predators are required to achieve control of the population. We expect that the logistic regression model is not complex enough to show the expected "hump" in our data.

326 Specialist predators only feed on one prey type. Even at low prey densities, they will keep 327 searching for this prey or they die. Therefore, specialist predator-prey systems are characterized by 328 large oscillations through time (Turchin and Hanski 1997; Hanski et al. 2001; Symondson et al. 2002; 329 Mukhopadhyay and Bhattacharyya 2013). A linear prey isocline is expected, as more predators are 330 required when prey densities increase. Indeed, the prey isocline of the P. persimilis-T. urticae predator-331 prey system appeared to be a linear curve. When more spider mites are present, more predatory mites 332 are required. The slope of this curve is not steep and becomes almost horizontal, which resembles the 333 classic Lotka-Volterra model (Gausse et al. 1936). The trial did not last long enough to detect 334 population oscillation in time. Figure 1 clearly shows a dramatic drop of both predator and prey on all 335 plants, causing local extinctions of spider mites and/or predatory mites. In addition, the "hump" caused by the carrying capacity of the crop was expected (Rosenzweig & MacArthur 1963), as it was 336 337 included in other spider mite models (Kozlova et al. 2005; Kuang et al. 2017), but was not observed. 338 Again, we expect that the logistic regression model is not complex enough to show these dynamics.

To conclude, this study provides actual, realistic generalist and specialist predator-prey dynamics based on real field data. In order to model the essential parameters (i.e. prey isoclines and the chance of biocontrol) the available data was simplified and complex mathematical modelling was avoided. The validated models are easy to interpret. We acknowledge the fact that more complex dynamics, like the lack of a carrying capacity, are masked in our modelling approach. However, for biocontrol purposes these models are easy to implement as a decision tool in the near future. Many

-14-

345 Northwestern European tomato growers are monitoring their crop using yellow sticky traps (Böckmann et al. 2015; Pinto-Zevallos and Vänninen 2013). This way, they obtain quantitative data of 346 347 both the pest and the predator (e.g. whiteflies and mirids). Unfortunately, most growers focus on the 348 densities of the pest and not the predators. Tools for more efficient monitoring, like automatic 349 counting of pests and predators on yellow sticky traps, are under active development and will 350 encourage growers to monitor in a standardized way (Moerkens et al. 2019). In the near future, 351 growers will be able to automatically count insects on yellow sticky traps using smartphone images. As 352 these data are fed into the presented population models a decision support system will increase the 353 efficiency of biocontrol actions, like the release of additional biocontrol agents or spot treatments 354 with selective pesticides. Currently the tools presented require some form of interpretation, as a 355 greenhouse in which plant protection products has been used, or in which alternative predator or pest 356 species are present can alter the associations between pest control and prey and predator densities. 357 Therefor we recommend the use of this decision support system in collaboration with a biological crop 358 advisor. In the future, more data will allow comparable analysis using machine learning techniques, 359 which will hopefully be able to forecast densities of predator and prey. Additional parameters like 360 temperature, humidity, growing stage of the plant, time (week, month)... can be added in order to 361 increase the predictive power of the models and reduce variation.

Monitoring quantitative spider mite and predatory mite densities on leaves is more labor intensive. It is unlikely growers will start counting all these mites. New automatic approaches with standardized images of leaves are required. Only then, will the above described model be applicable on a large scale in greenhouses.

366

367

368

### **369 Compliance with Ethical Standards:**

-15-

370 Funding: The Agency Flanders Innovation & Entrepreneurship (VLAIO) (140948, 160427)

371

372 Conflict of Interest: All authors declares that they have no conflict of interest.

373

Ethical approval: This article does not contain any studies with human participants performed by any
of the authors. All applicable international, national, and/or institutional guidelines for the care and
use of animals were followed.

377

## 378 References

- 379 Alatawi F, Nechols JR, Margolies DC (2011) Spatial distribution of predators and prey affect biological
- 380 control of twospotted spider mites by *Phytoseiulus persimilis* in greenhouses. Biol Control 56:36–
- 381 42. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocontrol.2010.09.006
- 382 Alomar O, Riudavets J, Castañé C (2006) Macrolophus caliginosus in the biological control of Bemisia
- 383 tabaci on greenhouse melons. Biol Control 36:154–162.
  384 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocontrol.2005.08.010
- 385 Bancroft JS, Margolies DC (1999) An individual-based model of an acarine tritrophic system: lima bean,
- 386 Phaseolus lunatus L., twospotted spider mite, Tetranychus urticae (Acari: Tetranychidae), and
- 387 *Phytoseiulus persimilis* (Acari: Phytoseiidae). Ecol Model 123:161–181.
- 388 https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-3800(99)00131-3
- 389 Bernstein C (1985) A Simulation Model for an Acarine Predator-Prey System (Phytoseiulus persimilis-
- 390 *Tetranychus urticae*). J Anim Ecol 54:375-389. https://doi.org/10.2307/4485
- 391 Blaeser P, Sengonca C, Zegula T (2004) The potential use of different predatory bug species in the
- 392 biological control of *Frankliniella occidentalis* (Pergande) (Thysanoptera: Thripidae). J Pest Sci
- 393 77:211–219. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10340-004-0057-2

Böckmann E, Hommes M, Meyhöfer R (2015) Yellow traps reloaded: what is the benefit for decision
making in practice? J Pest Sci 88:439–449. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10340-014-0601-7

- Brenard N, Sluydts V, De Bruyn L, Leirs H, Moerkens R (2018) Food supplementation to optimize
   inoculative release of the predatory bug *Macrolophus pygmaeus* in sweet pepper. Entomol Exp
   Appl 166:574-582. https://doi.org/10.1111/eea.12704
- Brenard N, Sluydts V, Christianen E, Bosmans L, De Bruyn L, Moerkens R, Leirs H (2019) Biweekly
  supplementation with *Artemia* spp. cysts allows efficient population establishment by *Macrolophus pygmaeus* in sweet pepper. Entomol Exp Appl. https://doi.org/10.1111/eea.12776
  Calvo FJ, Bolckmans, K, Belda JE (2012a) Release rate for a pre-plant application of *Nesidiocoris tenuis*for *Bemisia tabaci* control in tomato. Biocontrol 57:809–817. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10526012-9455-1
- Calvo FJ, Lorente MJ, Stansly PA, Belda JE (2012b) Preplant release of *Nesidiocoris tenuis* and
  supplementary tactics for control of *Tuta absoluta* and *Bemisia tabaci* in greenhouse tomato.
  Entomol Exp Appl 143:111–119. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1570-7458.2012.01238.x
- Carnero A, Diaz S, Amador S, Hernandez M, Hernandez E (2000) Impact of *Nesidiocoris tenuis*(Heteroptera, Miridae) on whitefly populations in protected tomato crops. Bulletin IOBC/wprs,
  23:259.
- Castañé C, Aloma, O, Goula M, Gabarra R (2004) Colonization of tomato greenhouses by the predatory
  mirid bugs *Macrolophus caliginosus* and *Dicyphus tamaninii*. Biol Control 30:591–597.
  https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocontrol.2004.02.012.
- 414 Drukker B, Janssen A, Ravensberg W, Sabelis MW (1997) Improved control capacity of the mite
  415 predator *Phytoseiulus persimilis* (Acari: Phytoseiidae) on tomato. Expl Appl Acarol 21:507-518.
  416 https://doi.org/10.1023/B:APPA.0000018885.35044.c6
- 417 Enkegaard A Brodsgaard HF, Hansen DL (2001) *Macrolophus caliginosus*: Functional response to 418 whiteflies and preference and switching capacity between whiteflies and spider mites. Entomol
- 419 Exp Appl 101:81–88. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1019230603364

-17-

- 420 Frans M, Moerkens R, Van Gool S, Sauviller C, Van Laethem S, Luca S, Aerts R, Ceusters J (2018)
- 421 Modelling greenhouse climate factors to constrain internal fruit rot (*Fusarium* spp.) in bell pepper.
- 422 J Plant Dis Prot 125:425-432. https://doi.org/10.1007/s41348-018-0159-3
- 423 Gause GF, Smaragdova NP, Witt AA (1936) Further studies of interaction between predators and prey.
- 424 J Anim Ecol, 5:1-18. https://doi.org/10.2307/1087
- 425 Gough N (1991) Long-term stability in the interaction between *Tetranychus urticae* and *Phytoseiulus*
- 426 *persimilis* producing successful integrated control on roses in southeast Queensland. Exp Appl
- 427 Acarol 12:83-101. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01204402
- 428 Hanski I, Hansson L, Henttonen H (1991) Specialist predators, generalist predators, and the microtine
- 429 rodent cycle. J Anim Ecol 60:353-367. https://doi.org/10.2307/5465
- 430 Hanski I, Hentonnen H, Korpimäki E, Oksanen L, Turchin P (2001) Small-rodent dynamics and predation.
- 431 Ecology 82:1505-1520. https://doi.org/10.2307/2679796
- 432 Ingegno BI, Pansa MG, Tavella L (2011) Plant preference in the zoophytophagous generalist predator
- 433 *Macrolophus pygmaeus* (Heteroptera: Miridae). Biol Control 58:174–181.

434 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocontrol.2011.06.003

- 435 Kozlova I, Singh M, Easton A, Ridland P (2005) Twospotted Spider Mite Predator-Prey Model. Math
- 436 Comput Model 42:1287-1298. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mcm.2005.01.036
- 437 Křivan V (1996) Optimal Foraging and Predator–Prey Dynamics. Theor Pop Biol. 49: 265-290.
- 438 https://doi.org/10.1006/tpbi.1996.0014

439 Křivan V (2011) On the Gause predator-prey model with a refuge: a fresh look at the history. J Theor

- 440 Biol 274:67-73. https://doi.org/ 10.1016/j.jtbi.2011.01.016
- 441 Křivan V, Priyadarshi A (2015) L-shaped prey isocline in the Gause predator-prey experiments with a
- 442 prey refuge. J Theor Biol 370:21-26. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtbi.2015.01.021
- 443 Kuang Y, Ben-Arieh B, Zhao S, Wu CH, Margolies D, Nechols J (2017) Mathematical Model for Two-
- 444 Spotted Spider Mites System: Verification and Validation. Open Journal of Modelling and
- 445 Simulation 5:13-31. https://doi.org/10.4236/ojmsi.2017.51002

-18-

- Nomikou M, Janssen A, Schraag R, Sabelis MW (2002) Phytoseiid predators suppress populations of *Bemisia tabaci* on cucumber plants with alternative food. Exp Appl Acarol 27: 57–68.
  https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1021559421344
- 449 Messelink G, Janssen A (2014) Increased control of thrips and aphids in greenhouses with two species
- 450 of generalist predatory bugs involved in intraguild predation. Biol Control 79:1–7.
- 451 <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocontrol.2014.07.009</u>
- 452 Moerkens R, Berckmoes E, Van Damme V, Ortega-Parra N, Hanssen I, Wutack M, Wittemans L, Casteels
- 453 H, Tirry L, De Clercq P, De Vis R (2016) High population densities of *Macrolophus pygmaeus* on
- 454 tomato plants can cause economic fruit damage: Interaction with Pepino mosaic virus? Pest
- 455 Manag Sci, 72:1350–1358. https://doi.org/10.1002/ps.4159
- Moerkens R, Vanlommel W, Vanderbruggen R, Van Delm T (2016) The added value of LED assimilation
  light in combination with high pressure sodium lamps in protected tomato crops in Belgium. Acta
  Hortic, 1134:119-124. https://doi.org/10.17660/ActaHortic.2016.1134.16
- 459 Moerkens R, Berckmoes E, Van Damme V, Wittemans L, Tirry L, Casteels H, De Clercq P, De Vis R (2017)
- 460 Inoculative release strategies of *Macrolophus pygmaeus* Rambur (Hemiptera:Miridae) in tomato
- 461 crops: population dynamics and dispersal. J Plant Dis Prot 124:295–303.
  462 https://doi.org/10.1007/s41348-017-0077-9
- Moerkens R, Brenard N, Bosmans L, Reybroeck E, Janssen D, Hemming J, Sluydts V (2019) Protocol for
   semi-automatic identification of whiteflies *Bemisia tabaci* and *Trialeurodes vaporariorum* on
   yellow sticky traps. J Appl Entomol. https://doi.org/10.1111/jen.12630
- 466 Mukhopadhyay B, Bhattacharyya R (2013) Vole population dynamics under the influence of specialist 467 and generalist predation. Nat Resour Model 26: 91-110. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1939-
- 468 7445.2012.00122.x
- 469 Opit GP, Nechols JR, Margolies DC (2004) Biological control of twospotted spider mites, *Tetranychus* 470 *urticae* Koch (Acari: Tetranychidae), using *Phytoseiulus persimilis* Athias-Henriot (Acari:

-19-

- 471 Phytoseidae) on ivy geranium: assessment of predator release ratios. Biol Control 29:445-452.
- 472 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocontrol.2003.08.007
- 473 Perdikis D, Lykouressis D (2000) Effects of various items, host plants, and temperatures on the
- 474 development and survival of *Macrolophus pygmaeus* Rambur (Hemiptera: Miridae). Biol Control
- 475 17:55–60. https://doi.org/10.1006/bcon.1999.0774
- 476 Perdikis D, Lykouressis D (2002) Life table and biological characteristics of *Macrolophus pygmaeus*
- 477 when feeding on *Myzus persicae* and *Trialeurodes vaporariorum*. Entomol Exp Appl 102:261–272.
- 478 https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1570-7458.2002.00947.x
- 479 Pinto-Zevallos, Vänninen I (2013) Yellow sticky traps for decision-making in whitefly management:
- 480 What has been achieved? Crop Protection 47:74-84.
  481 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cropro.2013.01.009
- 482 R Core Team (2018) R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for
- 483 Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria.
- 484 Rosenzweig ML, MacArthur RH (1963) Graphical representation and stability conditions of predator–
  485 prey interactions. Am Nat 97:209–223. https://doi.org/10.1086/282272
- 486 Symondson WOC, Sunderland KD, Greenstone HM (2002. Can generalist predators be effective
- 487 biocontrol agents? Annu Rev Entomol 47:561-594.
- 488 https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.ento.47.091201.145240
- 489 Turchin P, Hanski I (1997) An Empirically Based Model for Latitudinal Gradient in Vole Population
- 490 dynamics. Am Nat 149:842-74. https://doi.org/10.1086/286027
- 491 Urbaneja A, Montón H, Mollá O (2009) Suitability of the tomato borer Tuta absoluta as prey or
- 492 Macrolophus pygmaeus and Nesidiocoris tenuis. J Appl Entomol 133:292–296. https://doi.org/
- 493 10.1111/j.1439-0418.2008.01319.x
- 494 Urbaneja A, González-Cabrera J, Arnó J, Gabarra R (2012) Prospects for the biological control of *Tuta*495 *absoluta* in tomatoes of the Mediterranean basin. Pest Manag Sci 68:1215–1222.
- 496 https://doi.org/10.1002/ps.3344

497	Urbaneja-Bernat P, Bru P, González-Cabrera J, Urbaneja A, Tena A (2019) Reduced phytophagy in
498	sugar-provisioned mirids. Journal of Pest Science <a href="https://doi.org/10.1007/s10340-019-01105-9">https://doi.org/10.1007/s10340-019-01105-9</a>
499	van Baalen, M., Krivan, V., van Rijn, P.C.J., Sabelis, M. 2001. Alternative food, switching predators, and
500	the persistence of predator-prey systems. Am Naturalist 157:512-524.
501	https://doi.org/10.1086/319933.
502	Van Lenteren JC, Van Roermund HJW, Sütterlin S (1996) Biological Control of Greenhouse Whitefly
503	(Trialeurodes vaporariorum) with the Parasitoid Encarsia formosa: How Does It Work? Biol Control
504	6:1–10. https://doi.org/10.1006/bcon.1996.0001
505	
506	
507	
508	
509	
510	
511	
512	
512	
513	
514	
515	Figures and Tables
516	Table 1. Model and validation dataset collection details for <i>M. pygmaeus – T. vaporariorum, N. tenuis</i>
517	– B. tabaci and P. persimilis – T. urticae predator-prey interactions. Different columns represent the

518 predator-prey interaction, the year of sampling, the individual grower, the location (city) of the

519 greenhouse, whether artificial light was used (lit/non-lit crops), the number of yellow sticky traps or

520 plants that were sampled, the number of data assessments (#YST or plants multiplied by sampling

521 occasions (time)) and whether the dataset was used for model input or validation.

Predator-prey	Year	Grower	Location (Belgium)	Lit/non-	# YST/	#	Dataset
				lit	plants	assessments	
M. pygmaeus	2016	Grower A	Hoogstraten	lit	42	588	model
- <i>T</i> .	2017	PCH*	Hoogstraten	lit	8	56	model
vaporariorum	2018	PCH*	Hoogstraten	non-lit	53	904	model
	2018	PCH*	Hoogstraten	lit	12	293	model
	2018	Grower B	Putte	lit	10	145	validation
	2018	Grower C	Rijkevorsel	lit	10	97	validation
	2018	Grower D	Rijkevorsel	non-lit	10	176	validation
	2018	Grower E	Rijkevorsel	non-lit	10	101	validation
	2018	Grower F	Broechem	lit	10	140	validation
	2018	Grower F	Broechem	non-lit	10	100	validation
	2018	Grower B	Putte	non-lit	10	130	validation
N. tenuis - B.	2018	Grower G	La Venta Del Viso	non-lit	20	320	validation
tabaci	2018	Grower H	Vícar	non-lit	20	320	model
	2018	Grower I	Vícar	non-lit	20	320	validation
	2018	Grower J	La Cañada	non-lit	20	260	validation
P. persimilis -	2016	PCH*	Hoogstraten	non-lit	252	2016	model
	2017	PCH*	Hoogstraten	non-lit	476	5712	Validation

526 Table 2. Parameter estimates and statistics of the logistic regression models for each predator-prey527 interaction

Predator-prey	Parameter	Estimate	SE	Statistics
M. pygmaeus - T. vaporariorum	Intercept	-5.218	0.271	z = -19.25; P < 0.0001
	Predator	1.677	0.155	z = 10.82; P < 0.0001
	Prey	1.518	0.131	z = 11.62; P < 0.0001
N. tenuis - B. tabaci	Intercept	-4.233	0.870	z = -4.87; P < 0.0001
	Predator	2.395	0.387	z = 6.19; P < 0.0001
	Prey	1.510	0.496	z = 3.04; P = 0.0023
P. persimilis - T. urticae	Intercept	-3.135	0.288	z = -10.88; P < 0.0001
	Predator	12.025	0.986	z= 12.20; P < 0.0001
	Prey	0.728	0.135	z = 5.39; P < 0.0001
	Predator*Prey	-3.040	0.406	z = -7.50; P < 0.0001

541 Figure Legends



542

Figure 1. Averaged (± SE) population densities of all datasets combined for three different predatorprey interactions, namely *M. pygmaeus – T. vaporariorum*, *N. tenuis – B. tabaci*, *P. persimilis – T. urticae*. The binomial classification for periods when the prey population increases (0) or decreases (1)
is indicated between brackets for each time point.



547

Figure 2. Validation of the logistic regression models for all three predator-prey systems. Estimated probability of biocontrol from the logistic regression models, and observed chance of biocontrol by manual counting of 0 and 1's. Numbers in brackets indicate the number of data points for each category (0.1, 0.2, 0.3, 0.4, 0.5, 0.6, 0.7, 0.8, 0.9, 1).



552

Figure 3. Numerical simulations of the logistic regression models. Prey isoclines were calculated at a probability of achieving biological control of 0.5. Prey isocline boundaries at 25 and 75% were included. The light grey areas represent situations where the pest population will increase because not enough predators are present (possibly extra control measurements are required). Similarly, the dark grey areas represent situations where the pest population will decrease (no further control actions needed).