



UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS

This is a repository copy of *Spotlight on insects: trends, threats and conservation challenges*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:
<http://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/159087/>

Version: Accepted Version

Article:

Didham, RK, Barbero, F, Collins, CM et al. (6 more authors) (2020) Spotlight on insects: trends, threats and conservation challenges. *Insect Conservation and Diversity*, 13 (2). pp. 99-102. ISSN 1752-458X

<https://doi.org/10.1111/icad.12409>

© 2020 The Royal Entomological Society. This is the peer reviewed version of the following article: Didham, RK, Barbero, F, Collins, CM et al. (6 more authors) (2020) Spotlight on insects: trends, threats and conservation challenges. *Insect Conservation and Diversity*, 13 (2). pp. 99-102. ISSN 1752-458X, which has been published in final form at <http://doi.org/10.1111/icad.12409>. This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance with Wiley Terms and Conditions for Use of Self-Archived Versions.

Reuse

Items deposited in White Rose Research Online are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved unless indicated otherwise. They may be downloaded and/or printed for private study, or other acts as permitted by national copyright laws. The publisher or other rights holders may allow further reproduction and re-use of the full text version. This is indicated by the licence information on the White Rose Research Online record for the item.

Takedown

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.



eprints@whiterose.ac.uk
<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/>

1 **SPECIAL ISSUE**

2 **Spotlight on insects: trends, threats and conservation challenges**

3

4 RAPHAEL K. DIDHAM^{1,2}, FRANCESCA BARBERO³, C. MATILDA COLLINS⁴,
5 MATTHEW L. FORISTER⁵, CHRISTOPHER HASSALL⁶, SIMON R. LEATHER⁷,
6 LAURENCE PACKER⁸, MANU E. SAUNDERS⁹ and ALAN J. A. STEWART¹⁰

7

8 ¹School of Biological Sciences, The University of Western Australia, Crawley WA 6009, Australia

9 ²CSIRO Health & Biosecurity, Centre for Environment and Life Sciences, Floreat WA 6014, Australia

10 ³Department of Life Sciences and Systems Biology, University of Turin, Turin, 10123, Italy

11 ⁴Centre for Environmental Policy, Imperial College London, The Weeks Building, 16-18 Princes Gardens,
12 London SW7 1NE, UK

13 ⁵Department of Biology, Program in Ecology, Evolution and Conservation Biology, University of Nevada,
14 Reno, NV 89557, USA

15 ⁶School of Biology, Faculty of Biological Sciences, University of Leeds, Leeds, UK

16 ⁷Department of Crop & Environment Sciences, Harper Adams University, Edgmond Newport, Shropshire TF10
17 8NB, UK

18 ⁸Department of Biology, York University, 4700 Keele St., ON, M3J 1P3, Canada

19 ⁹School of Environmental & Rural Science, University of New England, Armidale NSW Australia

20 ¹⁰School of Life Sciences, University of Sussex, Falmer, Brighton BN1 9QG, UK

21

22 **Running title:** Spotlight on insects

23

24 **Abstract**

25 1. There is mounting concern over the conservation status and long-term trends in insect
26 populations. Many insect populations have been reported to be falling and many species are
27 threatened with extinction. While this is true, the evidence does not support unqualified

28 statements of ‘global insect decline’. Global environmental change does not affect all species
29 equally, and there are clear winners as well as losers from anthropogenic impacts.

30 2. In this special issue of *Insect Conservation and Diversity*, we draw together articles that (i)
31 identify key challenges in robust inference about insect population trends, (ii) present new
32 empirical evidence for declines (and increases) in insect populations, spanning whole
33 communities down to single species, in both aquatic and terrestrial ecosystems, and (iii)
34 address the interacting drivers of population change, from empirical studies of environmental
35 correlates, to experimental manipulation of driving mechanisms.

36 3. We argue that the way forward for insect conservation includes more nuanced language
37 and approaches when communicating ecological evidence to peer and public audiences,
38 beyond just a simplistic focus on the insect decline narrative. This will require an expanded
39 portfolio of approaches to promote the value of insects to society, which in turn, should
40 reinforce the social licence to prioritise insect conservation research. This should help us to
41 deliver the rigorous science necessary to document ongoing trends, and understand the
42 drivers and mechanisms of population change. Only then will we be able to mitigate or
43 reverse declining populations.

44

45 **Keywords:** citizen science, global insect decline, insect conservation, monitoring, population
46 trends

47

48 Clear, concise statements are needed to convey urgency to a broad audience – ‘Insects are
49 declining’ – is one such statement that has received global attention. Unfortunately, the intent
50 behind many of the scientific articles is often misinterpreted as a result of dramatic language
51 which the media then amplifies, potentially leading to inaccurate sensationalism. As
52 scientists, we have an obligation to weigh up the objective empirical evidence to support or

53 refute such claims, over and above our subjective advocacy of a normative position that
54 might influence policy (*cf* Vucetich & Nelson, 2010). Therefore, we might retort that the
55 situation is indeed serious, because some (perhaps many) insect species are declining across
56 most taxonomic lineages in most regions of world, and at potentially increasing rates as
57 anthropogenic impacts intensify globally. ‘But’ (the scientists’ qualifier) there are also many
58 other insect species expanding their geographic ranges in response to changing climatic
59 conditions, or increasing in abundance in cases where they benefit from human activities.
60 Adding such qualifiers to general decline statements is more balanced, but presents a much
61 more complex and nuanced picture that may not be as immediately comprehensible for non-
62 scientists (and media reports). A similar challenge arises when communicating scientific
63 evidence with respect to the causes of declines. It is abundantly clear from decades of
64 scientific research and conservation management that habitat loss and degradation combined
65 with climate change are the leading stressors for insects and other groups. That remains true
66 even when it is challenging to rank the stressors in terms of impact for any one species or in
67 different locations. Conveying that subtlety (what we know about drivers of decline in
68 general versus for any one species) is an important challenge for scientists moving forward in
69 an increasingly anthropogenically-modified world. For all of these issues, the challenge is to
70 convey the seriousness of concern, without alarmist rhetoric.

71 Here, we compile a special issue of *Insect Conservation and Diversity*, ‘Spotlight on
72 insects: trends, threats and conservation challenges’, comprising a collection of 12 articles
73 that not only draws together new long-term empirical data on declines (and increases) in
74 insect populations, spanning whole communities down to single species, in both aquatic and
75 terrestrial ecosystems, but also identifies key challenges in making robust inferences about
76 population trends, and addresses the interacting drivers of population change. Together, the
77 articles in the special issue present a forward-looking prospectus for the future of insect

78 population monitoring, that we hope will stimulate more robust integration and validation of
79 available data, new opportunities for more creative exploitation of technological of
80 computational advances, and an expanded portfolio of strategies for promoting the
81 importance and value of insects to society.

82 In the lead article, our team of editors at *Insect Conservation and Diversity* presents a
83 perspective on the inherent risks of making broad statements about ‘global insect decline’ if
84 the quantitative evidence underpinning these statements is still a subject of ongoing
85 investigation and even uncertainty (Didham *et al.*, 2020). Didham *et al.* (2020) identify seven
86 key challenges in drawing robust inference about insect population declines, ranging from
87 establishment of a reliable historical baseline, representativeness of site selection, robustness
88 of time series trend estimation, and mitigation of detection bias effects, to the ability to
89 account for potential artefacts of density-dependence, phenological shifts and scale-
90 dependence in extrapolation from sample abundance to population-level inference. Meeting
91 all of these issues head-on will be a challenge, but Didham *et al.* (2020) present pragmatic
92 guidelines for best-practice approaches that will help avoid methodological errors, mitigate
93 potential biases and produce more robust analyses of time series trends in the future.

94 Some of the most compelling evidence for changing insect population trends through
95 time has come from long-term monitoring networks using standardised insect sampling
96 devices, such as suction traps, light traps, pitfall traps or Malaise traps. Bell *et al.* (2020)
97 present quantitative time series trends for aphids and moths in the UK, drawn from the
98 world’s longest standardised terrestrial insect time series at the Rothamsted Insect Survey.
99 From light-trap data at 112 sites (25 for suction traps) and time series of up to 48 years in
100 length, Bell *et al.* (2020) show that moths declined in abundance by over 30% from 1969-
101 2016, while aphid populations did not exhibit directional change over the same time period.
102 Moreover, moth declines were not ubiquitous across species or habitat types, with robust and

103 biologically-significant declines only found in coastal, urban and woodland habitats, but not
104 in agricultural, parkland or scrubland habitats (Bell *et al.*, 2020).

105 In the Netherlands, Hallmann *et al.* (2020) monitored populations of a number of
106 different terrestrial and aquatic insect taxa using light trapping and pitfall trapping at up to 48
107 sites over time series of up to 26 years, and detected declines in abundance and biomass (of
108 up to 40-60%) for moths, beetles and caddisflies, while true bugs, mayflies and lacewings did
109 not exhibit similar changes. Even in those groups showing declines, not all species were
110 affected equally. Moth species associated with grass or herb host-plants were more severely
111 affected, as were ground beetle species that were closely associated with xerophytic habitats
112 (Hallmann *et al.*, 2020). This would tend to suggest that land-use and land management
113 changes were important drivers of population trends, but causal mechanisms could not be
114 specifically identified.

115 Meanwhile, Roth *et al.* (2020), present one of the rare examples of long-term
116 monitoring of insect species in freshwater pond and pool ecosystems, over a 28-year period
117 in southern Germany. The authors explicitly account for natural successional changes in
118 water chemistry and habitat conditions that lead to the loss of specialised water beetle species
119 from early-successional pond habitats over time. They also found an overall decline in
120 abundance and loss of species due to the eutrophication of mature fen and moorland ponds,
121 although there was a trend to increasing abundance with some environmental attributes (Roth
122 *et al.*, 2020). Together, these effects resulted in a decline in habitat specialist species, a
123 reduction in overall water beetle diversity and homogenization of community composition
124 across 'pond-scape' networks.

125 These themes of varying taxon-specific responses through time and strong context-
126 dependence of responses to varying drivers of population change are exceptionally well
127 demonstrated in the Catalan Butterfly Monitoring Scheme. Ubach *et al.* (2020) compiled

128 citizen science monitoring records for 147 butterfly species at 54 sites in Catalonia, Andorra
129 and Menorca over time series varying from 10 to 21 years, and found an overwhelming
130 decline of open-habitat specialists and increase in forest habitat specialist species through
131 time as widespread agricultural land-abandonment led to forest encroachment (at >75% of all
132 sites). The winners and losers in long-term population trends are dependent on the causal
133 driver(s) of decline. In this case, abandonment of traditional land uses, not intensification of
134 agriculture, leads to population decline in open-area specialists (Ubach *et al.*, 2020), at least
135 some of which are of conservation concern.

136 Extensive use of citizen scientists in survey programmes and non-lethal approaches to
137 monitoring insects also feature heavily in long-term single-species monitoring of iconic or
138 threatened species of conservation concern. For instance, Gardiner & Didham (2020) present
139 an 18-year time series of standardised transect survey counts of glowing adult female glow-
140 worms at 19 sites in across south-east England. These transects were surveyed by a team of
141 committed citizen scientists for nearly two decades. Average glowing counts declined by
142 around 75% over the survey period (ca. -3.5% per annum), driven partly by a warming and
143 drying climate (Gardiner & Didham, 2020), and accounting for advancing spring phenology.
144 Temporal trajectories in abundance were inconsistent across sites, however, suggesting local-
145 scale site factors such as unmanaged scrub encroachment might drive greater reduction in
146 numbers at some sites than others (Gardiner & Didham, 2020).

147 Baur *et al.* (2020) also used a non-lethal transect count approach to survey trends in
148 population abundance of a threatened flightless longhorn beetle at 13 sites in Switzerland,
149 France and Germany over a 20 year time series. Overall population abundance declined by
150 90% through time, but with varying rates of decline at different sites (Baur *et al.*, 2020).
151 Environmental correlates and the degree of synchronicity of population fluctuations across
152 sites suggest that climate drivers probably only have a small influence on population changes,

153 while the main drivers of decline are likely to be intensification of agricultural land-use,
154 leading to strong shifts in plant species composition, reduction in host-plant availability and
155 loss of warm sun-exposed microhabitats (Baur *et al.*, 2020).

156 In the USA, Belitz *et al.* (2020) compiled occurrence records for the endangered
157 Poweshiek skipperling butterfly from 1872 to present, aggregating observation-based and
158 specimen-based records from surveys, museum records, researchers and citizen scientists to
159 build a composite picture of geographic range contraction through time. Despite being
160 historically common in prairies across the upper mid-western USA (217 sites), populations
161 have declined rapidly to local extinction in the last 20 years at all but five extant locations
162 (Belitz *et al.*, 2020). Ecological niche models were constructed using climatic, landscape-
163 scale habitat, pesticide and fragmentation data to test the putative drivers of decline, and
164 evidence suggested that key causal drivers varied between regions and through time (Belitz *et*
165 *al.*, 2020). Poweshiek skipperling occurrence in the period prior to its steepest decline was
166 predominantly predicted by climate variables, whereas rapid range contractions in the 2000s
167 and 2010s were driven by land-use variation, with eastern and western populations
168 responding differently, and at different time intervals (Belitz *et al.*, 2020). Management
169 strategies to conserve this butterfly species will hinge not only on local-scale site suitability,
170 but also surrounding landscape-level drivers of population threat.

171 Although correlative associations and ecological niche modeling have important roles
172 to play in identifying putative drivers of decline, it is rare to find explicit experimental tests
173 of the causal mechanisms driving population change. One potential factor influencing the
174 abundance of the iconic Monarch butterfly could be exposure to elevated levels of heavy-
175 metals in their Milkweed foodplants where they grow along roadsides. Shephard *et al.* (2020)
176 found that caterpillars experimentally exposed to different levels of zinc in artificial diet had
177 reduced survival, but at levels above those reported from roadside areas studied in the

178 Midwestern USA. For contrast, they also studied the generalist and ubiquitous Cabbage white
179 butterfly and observed very different (even positive) responses to elevated zinc. Taken
180 together, these results highlight the need for additional experimental work on toxin exposure,
181 especially in non-pest insects, and more broadly that future studies should consider
182 experimental discrimination of putative drivers of decline.

183 As Didham *et al.*, (2020) point out, there are many challenges and pitfalls involved in
184 identifying generalised long-term trends for a given insect population, but we hope that the
185 eight empirical articles presented here in this special issue provide compelling examples of
186 the sorts of approaches that can help tease out some of the response diversity that is inherent
187 in insect communities and provide more robust general estimates of overall trends. In contrast
188 to some of the more ‘depressing’ media coverage on the subject, there is a promising future
189 for insect population monitoring, with many opportunities available for creative analysis of
190 existing baseline data.

191 Regardless of the data gaps and uncertainty around specific species, locations and
192 drivers, we know enough about insect biodiversity and conservation threats to communicate
193 more effectively with peer and public audiences. Saunders *et al.* (2020) provide an important
194 reminder of how word choices affect messaging. Decline has become a common word used
195 in scientific papers and popular media discussion of insect population trends. However, the
196 use of this terminology can be subjective, has inherent negative connotations, and is not
197 always the most appropriate or effective language choice to drive public engagement and
198 conservation action. Increasing understanding of insect diversity through nuanced and
199 objective discussion is essential to gain public and political support.

200 Despite the critical contribution of insects to ecosystem services and a general
201 awareness that 'something is not right', insect conservation remains the poor cousin to
202 mammal and bird conservation. Hart & Sumner (2020) broach the conversation on how we

203 might better 'market' insects to increase public appreciation of their multiple values. They
204 suggest that conservation of less-charismatic taxa, and of diverse ecosystems as a whole,
205 could well be improved by adapting tools from the world of commercial marketing. Hart &
206 Sumner (2020) propose the application of the '4Ps' framework (product, price, place and
207 promotion) to insect conservation, and suggest that it can be used to foster greater adoption of
208 pro-environmental behaviours and contribute to resolving the challenge of 'selling' insects to
209 an often reluctant public. This idea builds from the existing ecosystem services framework,
210 which already provides a scientific groundwork for measuring and classifying the many
211 different ways that humans value insects. Hart & Sumner (2020) focus specifically on public
212 engagement, arguing that commercial marketing approaches offer a lot of inspiration for
213 campaigns to educate and engage public audiences about the wonderful world of insects.

214 There are many reasons to be positive about the future of insect conservation. Novel
215 applications of old techniques, new technologies and increasing access to old and new data
216 are revealing more about global insect biodiversity than ever before. A growing body of
217 researchers from ecology and other disciplines are providing greater insight into how
218 environmental conditions and anthropogenic drivers impact insect species and community
219 interactions. The articles curated in this timely special issue provide many new paths forward
220 for rigorous research and more engaging public discourse on the value of insect conservation.

221

222 **Acknowledgements**

223 We thank the fabulous teams of contributing authors who have toiled for many decades to
224 bring empirical evidence to bear on the trends and drivers of insect population change. The
225 compilation of articles would not have been possible without the commitment and
226 contributions from the Editors at *Insect Conservation and Diversity*, and the efficient and
227 timely efforts of the editorial management team at Wiley.

228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

- Baur, B., Coray, A., Lenzin, H. & Schmera, D. (2020) Factors contributing to the decline of an endangered flightless longhorn beetle: a 20-year study. *Insect Conservation and Diversity*, **13**, [ICDIV-19-0222](https://doi.org/10.1111/icad.12399)
- Belitz, M.W, Monfils, M.J, Cuthrell, D.L. & Monfils, A.K. (2020) Landscape-level environmental stressors contributing to the decline of Poweshiek skipperling (*Oarisma poweshiek*). *Insect Conservation and Diversity*, **13**, <https://doi.org/10.1111/icad.12399>
- Bell, J.R., Blumgart, D. & Shortall, C.R. (2020) Are insects declining and at what rate? An analysis of standardised, systematic catches of aphid and moth abundances across Great Britain. *Insect Conservation and Diversity*, **13**, [ICDIV-19-0196](https://doi.org/10.1111/icad.12399)
- Didham, R.K., Basset, Y., Collins, C.M., Leather, S.R., Littlewood, N.A., Menz, M.H.M., Müller, J., Packer, L., Saunders, M.E., Schönrogge, K., Stewart, A.J.A., Yanoviak, S.P., & Hassall, C. (2020) Interpreting insect declines: seven challenges and a way forward. *Insect Conservation and Diversity*, **13**, [XXX](https://doi.org/10.1111/icad.12399).
- Gardiner, T. & Didham, R.K. (2020) Glowing, glowing, gone? Monitoring long term trends in glow-worm numbers in south-east England. *Insect Conservation and Diversity*, **13**, [ICDIV-19-0214](https://doi.org/10.1111/icad.12399)
- Hallmann, C.A., Zeegers, T., van Klink, R., Vermeulen, R., van Wielink, P., Spijkers, H., van Deijk, J., van Steenis, W. & Jongejans, E. (2020) Declining abundance of beetles, moths and caddisflies in the Netherlands. *Insect Conservation and Diversity*, **13**, [https://doi.org/10.1111/icad.12377](https://doi.org/10.1111/icad.12399)

- 253 Hart, A.G. & Sumner, S. (2020) Marketing insects: can exploiting a commercial framework
254 promote undervalued insect species? *Insect Conservation and Diversity*, **13**, ICDIV-20-
255 0021
- 256 Roth, N., Zoder, S., Zaman, A., Thorn, S. & Schmidl, J. (2020) Long-term monitoring reveals
257 decreasing water beetle diversities, loss of specialists, and community shifts over the past
258 28 years. *Insect Conservation and Diversity*, **13**, ICDIV-20-0003
- 259 Saunders, M.E., Janes, J. & O’Hanlon, J. (2020) Semantics of the insect decline narrative:
260 recommendations for communicating insect conservation to peer and public audiences.
261 *Insect Conservation and Diversity*, **13**, ICDIV-20-0035.
- 262 Shephard, A.M., Mitchell, T.S., Henry, S.B., Oberhauser, K.S., Kobiela, M.E. & Snell-Rood,
263 E.C. (2020) Assessing zinc tolerance in two butterfly species: consequences for
264 conservation in polluted environments. *Insect Conservation and Diversity*, **13**, ICDIV-19-
265 0227
- 266 Ubach, A., Páramo, F., Gutiérrez, C. & Stefanescu, C. (2020) Vegetation encroachment
267 drives changes in the composition of butterfly assemblages and species loss in
268 Mediterranean ecosystems. *Insect Conservation and Diversity*, **13**,
269 <https://doi.org/10.1111/icad.12397>
- 270 Vucetich, J.A. & Nelson, M.P. (2010) The moral obligations of scientists. *Minding Nature*, **3**,
271 48-50.