

Citizen science involving farmers as a means to document temporal trends in farmland biodiversity and relate them to agricultural practices

Olivier Billaud, Rose-line Vermeersch, Emmanuelle Porcher

▶ To cite this version:

Olivier Billaud, Rose-line Vermeersch, Emmanuelle Porcher. Citizen science involving farmers as a means to document temporal trends in farmland biodiversity and relate them to agricultural practices. Journal of Applied Ecology, 2020, 10.1111/1365-2664.13746. mnhn-02947862

HAL Id: mnhn-02947862 https://mnhn.hal.science/mnhn-02947862

Submitted on 24 Sep 2020

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers. L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

- 1 Citizen science involving farmers as a means to document temporal trends in farmland biodiversity
- 2 and relate them to agricultural practices.
- 3 Authors: Olivier Billaud^{1*}, Rose-Line Vermeersch¹, Emmanuelle Porcher¹
- 4 Author details:
- ⁵ ¹Centre d'Ecologie et des Sciences de la Conservation (CESCO), Muséum national d'Histoire naturelle,
- 6 Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, Sorbonne Université, Paris, France

7 Correspondence to :

- ^{*} Olivier Billaud, CESCO CP 135, Muséum national d'Histoire naturelle, 43 rue Buffon 75005 Paris,
- 9 +33-(0)140798134, olivier.billaud@edu.mnhn.fr

10

12 Abstract

- (1) Agricultural intensification is often recognized as a major driver of the decline of wild
 biodiversity in farmland. However, few studies have managed to collect relevant data to link
 the temporal dynamics of farmland biodiversity to the characteristics of intensive agriculture
 over large geographical areas.
- (2) We used 7 years of data from a French citizen science programme, wherein 1,216 farmers
 monitored biodiversity in 2,382 fields encompassing field crops, meadows, vineyards or
 orchards, to examine the temporal trends in abundance of five taxonomic groups of
 invertebrates (solitary bees, earthworms, butterflies, beetles, molluscs) and their links with
 agronomic practices and surrounding landscape.
- 22 (3) We observed significant temporal trends in abundance for many taxonomic groups and in 23 many crop types. Flying taxa (solitary bees and butterflies) were generally declining, while 24 the trends of soil taxa were more variable. Most trends were significantly related to farming 25 practices or landscape features. We observed a negative link between use of synthetic inputs (pesticides, mineral fertilization) and the trend in abundance of flying taxa in field crops, 26 27 while in meadows organic or mineral fertilization was the main explanatory practice, with contrasting relationships across taxonomic groups. Besides, the trend in abundance of 28 29 beetles and molluscs was more positive in permanent versus temporary meadows. Finally, in 30 vineyards the trend in abundance of solitary bees was positively related to the presence of 31 woodland in the landscape, whereas the reverse was true in meadows.
- (4) Synthesis and applications. Our results provide further support for the role of citizen science
 as a promising source of large-scale spatial and temporal data in farmland, contributing to
 the identification of agronomic practices that can help mitigate biodiversity decline. Our
 analyses suggest that reducing chemical inputs may not only reduce the decline in bees and
 butterflies, but sometimes even promote their regrowth. Increasing organic fertilization may
 foster bee and beetle abundance in meadows but reduce mollusc abundance, while

38	preventing ploughing of meadows may promote soil invertebrate abundance. Finally, such
39	citizen science programmes engage farmers to undertake monitoring. Whether such group
40	engagement may also contribute to biodiversity conservation by raising farmers' awareness
41	remains to be addressed.

42 Keywords: bees, beetles, butterflies, earthworms, fertilization, landscape, mollusks, pesticides

43 Additional abstract / Résumé

44 (1) L'intensification de l'agriculture est reconnue comme un facteur majeur du déclin de la

45 biodiversité sauvage dans les terres agricoles. Cependant, peu d'études ont pu relier les

46 changements temporels de la biodiversité agricole aux pratiques agricoles.

(2) Grâce aux données issues de l'Observatoire Agricole de la Biodiversité, un programme de science
participative ayant rassemblé 1216 agriculteurs entre 2011 et 2017, pour un total de 2382 parcelles
comprenant des grandes cultures, des prairies, des vignobles ou des vergers, nous avons étudié les
tendances temporelles de l'abondance de cinq groupes d'invertébrés (abeilles solitaires, vers de
terre, papillons, carabes, mollusques) et leurs liens avec les pratiques agronomiques et le paysage
environnant.

53 (3) Nous avons observé des variations temporelles significatives de l'abondance pour plusieurs 54 groupes taxonomiques et dans de nombreux types de cultures. Les taxons volants (abeilles solitaires 55 et papillons) sont en général en déclin, tandis que les tendances des taxons terrestres sont plus 56 variables. La plupart des tendances sont significativement corrélées aux pratiques agricoles ou au 57 paysage. L'utilisation d'intrants de synthèse (pesticides et fertilisation minérale) est corrélée au 58 déclin des taxons volants dans les grandes cultures, tandis que dans les prairies, la fertilisation 59 organique et/ou minérale est la principale pratique explicative, avec des relations contrastées entre 60 les groupes taxonomiques. En outre, les carabes et des mollusques sont en augmentation dans les 61 prairies permanentes mais en déclin dans les prairies temporaires. Enfin, dans les vignobles, les

variations d'abondance des abeilles solitaires sont positivement reliées à la présence de bois dans le
paysage, alors que l'inverse est vrai dans les prairies.

64 (4) Synthèse et applications. Nos résultats confortent le rôle de la science citoyenne comme source 65 prometteuse de données à grande échelle spatiale et temporelle dans les espaces agricoles, 66 contribuant à l'identification des pratiques agronomiques qui peuvent aider à atténuer le déclin de la 67 biodiversité. Nos analyses suggèrent que la réduction des intrants chimiques peut non seulement 68 réduire le déclin des abeilles et des papillons, mais parfois même favoriser leur augmentation. Une fertilisation organique plus importante peut favoriser l'abondance des abeilles et des carabes dans 69 70 les prairies mais réduire l'abondance des mollusques, tandis que le non-retournement des prairies 71 peut favoriser l'abondance des invertébrés du sol. Enfin, ces programmes de science citoyenne 72 incitent les agriculteurs à observer la biodiversité de leurs parcelles. Reste à savoir si cet engagement 73 collectif des agriculteurs peut également contribuer à la conservation de la biodiversité par une plus 74 forte sensibilisation sur le sujet.

75 1 | Introduction

Agricultural intensification is recognized as a major driver of the current biodiversity decline for
insects (Sánchez-Bayo & Wyckhuys, 2019; Seibold et al., 2019), birds (Stanton, Morrissey, & Clark,
2018) or soil biota (Ponge et al., 2013). Different mechanisms may explain this agriculture-driven
biodiversity loss, including non-target effects of pesticides (Zaller & Brühl, 2019), fertilization
(Haddad, Haarstad, & Tilman, 2000), tillage (Roger-Estrade, Anger, Bertrand, & Richard, 2010),
landscape simplification and homogenization (Gamez-Virues et al., 2015), etc. However, proving a
causal link between practices and biodiversity is often challenging.

83 Several limitations of studies relating biodiversity to farming practices are responsible for this lack of 84 conclusiveness. First, such studies are often restricted in space and time or focus on specific taxa, which hampers generalization (see Cardinale et al. 2011 for a review). In contrast, the few studies 85 86 that benefit from large-scale, long-term biodiversity monitoring data have limited information on 87 agronomic practices. For instance, Hallmann et al., (2017) could only speculate on the role of 88 agriculture in the massive decline in insect biomass, because they lacked accurate data on 89 agriculture. Second, most studies measuring the impacts of potential drivers assume space-for-time 90 substitution (SFT). SFT can be relevant to study the effects of slow environmental changes, by 91 comparing systems at different stages of development (Pickett, 1989). Such approach assumes that 92 the temporal dynamics of the sites can be ignored and that spatial patterns are due to different 93 ecological equilibria (Damgaard, 2019). These assumptions are true only when ecological processes 94 are quick compared to environmental changes (Damgaard, 2019), which may not apply for 95 biodiversity dynamics in rapidly changing agroecosystems (Jackson & Blois, 2015; Kratz, Deegan, 96 Harmon, & Lauenroth, 2003).

To our knowledge, only a handful of studies addressing the impacts of agricultural practices on
biodiversity included a true temporal dimension. Among them, Hallmann et al. (2014) linked the
introduction of neonicotinoids to a negative trend in insectivorous bird populations by comparing

100 different periods of surveys (before/after). Berger et al. (2018) observed a relationship between 101 changes in glyphosate application modes and amphibian migration. Finally Seibold et al. (2019) 102 showed a general decline of arthropods driven by land-use intensification at large spatial extent. 103 These temporal approaches to elucidate the role of agriculture in biodiversity changes are few 104 because they require gathering temporal and spatial data at large scales, which is labor and time 105 intensive. A way to solve this problem may be to capitalize on the recent expansion of citizen science 106 for biodiversity monitoring, which can involve geographically dispersed observers during several 107 years (Chandler et al., 2017).

In this article, we rely on a citizen science program designed for farmers to study temporal trends in
abundance of several taxonomic groups (solitary bees, earthworms, molluscs, beetles and
butterflies). We investigated how the temporal trends in abundance of these groups are correlated
with both agronomic practices and surrounding landscape. Documenting such relations may help
identify possible levers for the conservation of invertebrates in farmland, through changes in
agricultural practices.

114

115 2 | Materials and methods

116 **2.1** | Citizen science to monitor farmland biodiversity

117 The Farmland Biodiversity Observatory (FBO) is a French citizen science programme launched in 118 2011, wherein 1,216 farmers monitored biodiversity in 2,382 fields, thereby ensuring a good 119 representation of the diversity of farming practices and crop distribution across France (Fig. S1A). Four types of crops are monitored: field crops (1,515 fields), meadows (705 fields), vineyards (538 120 121 fields) and orchards (240 fields). We used data collected between 2011 and 2017. As in most citizen 122 science programmes, participant turnover is high in FBO, with a mean duration of participation from 123 1.22 to 1.39 years, depending on the taxonomic group monitored (Fig S1B). However, the number of 124 newly involved farmers each year is relatively stable through time, such that the dataset provides a

"series of pictures" of biodiversity throughout France. Note S1 provides more information on FBO,
the farmers involved, and ongoing research on how this programme changes farmer perceptions of
biodiversity.

128

129 2.2 | Biodiversity data

130 FBO focuses on four taxonomic groups chosen for their interconnections with agriculture: solitary bees (pollination services, Potts et al., 2016; Winfree, Williams, Dushoff, & Kremen, 2007), butterflies 131 132 (sensitive to changes in land use at the landscape scale, Dover & Settele, 2009; Nilsson, Franzen, & 133 Pettersson, 2013), earthworms (soil fertility, Lemtiri et al., 2014) and soil invertebrates (pests and 134 beneficial organisms, Kromp, 1999; Symondson, Sunderland, & Greenstone, 2002). Monitoring 135 protocols are simple, yet standardized. Observers can access keys to identify individuals to either 136 functional group or taxonomic rank (genus and sometimes species level). Bee monitoring uses two 137 trap nests of 32 tubes each placed in the field edge, facing south. Observers monitor nest occupancy 138 by counting sealed tubes (Fig. S2C). For butterflies, observers walk a 10 minutes transect (100-300m) 139 on the field edge, recording all individuals flying in a 5x5x5m cube around them (Fig. S2A). To 140 monitor soil invertebrates, three wooden cover-boards of 30x50 cm are laid on the ground, two at 141 the edge and one at the center of the plot (at 50m of the two others) (Fig. S2B). The observer quickly 142 lifts the board to count all invertebrates; identification focuses on beetles and mollusks but other 143 invertebrates are also reported. Finally, earthworms are sampled through three 1m² replicates 144 located 6 m apart inside the field. Each replicate is watered twice with 10L of a mustard solution (Fig. 145 S2D). Earthworms expelled to the surface by the irritant solution are collected, counted and sorted 146 into four functional groups: epigeic, black- and red-headed anecic and endogeic (Bouché, 1972). 147

In FBO, bees were monitored in 1,345 fields, butterflies in 727 fields, soil invertebrates in 807 fields
and earthworms in 685 fields (Fig. S3 shows the distribution of monitoring protocols across crop
types). The number of annual surveys per field varies across protocols. In theory, earthworms are

sampled only once in winter or early spring, bees and invertebrates are monitored once a month
between February and November, and butterflies are monitored five times per year between May
and September. However, some observers may skip some of the surveys. To handle this variation in
the number of observations per field and year, we did not work on annual summaries of biodiversity
data, but chose to use individual surveys. For each group we focused on the total abundance, since
most individuals cannot be identified to species level in the monitoring protocols. Moreover,
abundance is more sensitive to environmental changes than diversity (Pereira et al., 2013).

158

159 2.3 | Practices and landscape data

160 Farmers also provide information about the landscape surrounding the field and their agricultural 161 practices (Table S1 shows all variables associated with the protocols and crops). Some information is 162 common to all plots: pesticide use (insecticide, herbicide, fungicide, molluscicide, others), 163 fertilization (organic and mineral) and amendment (organic and calcium), which are provided as a 164 number of applications. The surrounding landscape is described via field edge types (wood-fringe, 165 hedge, grassy strip, roadside, ditch, flower strip, crop, other) and neighbouring land use (meadow, 166 wood, urban, pond, crop, other). The field edges described are those close to the trap nests and 167 transect for bees and butterflies; all edges for earthworms and invertebrates. Other information is 168 only relevant for some types of crops: tillage (direct sowing, shallow or deep ploughing) in field crops, 169 management of inter-rows (bare, partly grassy, grassy) in vineyards and orchards and use (mowing, 170 pasture, mix), type (temporary or permanent) and age in meadows. Complementary protocol-specific information includes: distance to the nearest tree for earthworms, flowers in the crop and edges for 171 172 butterflies and vegetation height for bees. Soil attributes (earthworms and invertebrates) and 173 weather (butterflies, earthworms and invertebrates) are also collected. We computed degree-day 174 (cumulative sum of temperature over zero) for each day using data from Cornes, Schrier, Besselaar, 175 & Jones (2018) and the R package climateExtract (Schmucki, 2020).

177 **2.4** | Multivariate analyses to summarize the diversity of in-field practices and surrounding

178 *landscape*

179 Agricultural practices, as well as landscape variables, are often correlated with one another due to 180 the consistency of agronomic systems. To circumvent this problem, we summarized practices and 181 landscape variables with multivariate analyses. We used a principal component analysis (PCA) on fertilization and pesticide use. We considered each crop type separately because they are associated 182 183 with contrasting production systems that use different amounts and classes of pesticides and 184 fertilization. These differences were easily seen on a PCA on all fields (Fig. 1A-B). However, regardless 185 of crop type, we observed the same general pattern in the outputs of the PCA, with the two main axes easily interpreted as a "chemical treatment axis" (mostly pesticides and mineral fertilization) 186 187 and an "organic fertilization" axis, respectively (Fig. 1C-D-E-F). In the following, we therefore used the 188 coordinates of fields on these axes as two uncorrelated variables describing the diversity of practices 189 (Fig. 1C-D-E-F).

190 In the same way, we applied a multiple correspondence analysis (MCA) on binary landscape variables 191 (presence / absence of elements in the edges or neighbouring land use) to summarize landscape 192 diversity around fields. We analysed taxonomic groups separately because protocols differ in the 193 number of surveyed field edges (see above). Nonetheless, for all protocols, one of the two first axes 194 was interpreted as proximity to woodland (Fig. S4-5-6-7). The meaning of the other axis was more 195 variable. For bees, butterflies, beetles and molluscs, it singled out the category "other" of the 196 surrounding landscape and was not easily interpretable. For earthworms, it contrasted the presence 197 of a pond versus adjacent crops (Fig. S4-5-6-7).

198

199

201 **2.5 | Statistical modelling to correlate temporal trends in group abundance with practices and**

202 landscape

203 To investigate the temporal trends in abundance per taxonomic group and their correlation with 204 farming practices and landscape variables, we used generalized linear mixed models (GLMM) (Bolker 205 et al., 2009). We assumed a negative binomial distribution of the data to take into account 206 overdispersion. We started from a complete model with year, practice and landscape variables (the 207 latter two being described by the first axes of the multivariate analyses), and their interactions, plus 208 relevant additional covariates depending on the taxonomic group (hereafter "control covariates", 209 Table S1) and a random effect of field. Practices were represented by the two axes of the PCA plus 210 crop type-dependent variables (Table S1). We also tested alternative models using the total number 211 of pesticide and (organic and mineral) fertilizer applications, instead of PCA axes, as a proxy for 212 intensification. Axes 1 and 2 of the MCA reflected the surrounding landscape (Fig. S4-5-6-7). The general structure of the model was the following: 213

214
$$\log(\mu_{AB}) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 Year + \beta_2 Axis 1_{PCA} + \beta_3 Axis 2_{PCA} + \beta_4 Axis 1_{MCA} + \beta_5 Axis 2_{MCA}$$

215

+
$$\beta_{6x}SpecificPractices$$
 + $\beta_{7x}Covariates$ + $\beta_{8}Year:Axis1_{PCA}$

216

6	+	β_9 Year: Axis2 _{PCA} +	β_{1}	₁₀ Year: Axis1	$_{MCA} +$	β_{12}	₁ Year: Axis	2 _{MCA}
---	---	--	-------------	---------------------------	------------	--------------	-------------------------	------------------

217 +
$$\beta_{12x}$$
Year: SpecificPractices + Field_i

With β_i the regression coefficients and *Field*_i the field-specific random effect. "Specific practices" 218 219 (tillage, inter-row...) and covariates (weather conditions, GPS coordinates...) varied depending on 220 protocol and type of crops (Table S1). All numerical variables were scaled. We selected variables 221 using backward stepwise elimination from a complete model and significance of the change in log-222 likelihood as a criterion. We checked that all the "control" covariates had a consistent relationship 223 with abundance, e.g. more abundant bees in the South or more abundant butterflies with lower wind 224 (Tables 1-5 and S2-6). As for earthworms, models were GLM since the random field effect was not 225 significant. We used the R package buildmer (Voeten, 2020).

Of five taxonomic groups and four crop types, we analysed only 18 separate models out of 20
because we discarded earthworm data in orchards and vineyards, which were too few (some years
with fewer than 10 surveys).

229 We diagnosed the fit of the models using the DHARMa package (Hartig, 2020). Over the 18 separate 230 models of crops and taxonomic groups, all QQ plots were acceptable upon visual inspection. No 231 Kolmogorov-Smirnov deviation test was significant, except for bees in field crops, for which the 232 significant deviation was visually small. The residuals were significantly but moderately spatially 233 autocorrelated (Table S17); introducing a covariance structure in the models did not modify the 234 results (not shown). Variance inflation factors (VIF), computed using the package performance 235 (Lüdecke, Makowski, Waggoner, & Patil, 2020), were generally below 2 (Tables S7-16) except for 236 artificially structured variables (e.g. degree days and squared degree days) and in models with a 237 significant effects of meadows use or type. Removing these variables did not change the results for 238 other variables (not shown). The models explained a fair amount of the variability in abundance, as 239 estimated following Nakagawa, Johnson, & Schielzeth (2017), although ca. 2/3 resided in the random 240 effect: from 0.1 to 0.35 without, and from 0.43 to 0.85 with the random field factor. Lastly, we analyzed interaction terms using the package ggeffects (Lüdecke, 2018), which computes marginal 241 242 effects of each variable with all others at their mean (quantitative variables) or at representative 243 values (qualitative variables) from statistical models (Figs. 2-4).

244

245 3 | Results

The 1,216 farmers provided multi-year data from their fields on five taxonomic groups and in four crop types, and the overall analysis showed that there were significant temporal trends in biodiversity abundance in 16 of the 18 analyses. Some trends are related to farming practices or surrounding landscape. Tables 1-5 display a summary of the models using the PCA axes ("chemical treatment" and "organic fertilization") as proxy for farming practices, while Tables S2-S6 give a summary of the models using the number of applications of pesticides and fertilization. For each combination of crop type and taxonomic group, these two types of model may differ slightly. In the following, we focus on results that seem most robust, i.e. significant in the two types of models, but we illustrate all significant interactions in Figures S11-14.

255

256 3.1 | Solitary bees

The abundance of solitary bees appeared to be declining significantly in all crops but vineyards, and these declines were related to farming intensity or landscape structure (Tables 1 and S2). Conversely, the trend was positive in vineyards. Declines were stronger in fields with more pesticide use or more mineral fertilization (effects are statistically difficult to separate) in field crops (Figs. 2 and S8). On the other hand, bee declines were less steep with more organic fertilization (field crops, meadows) as well as in vineyards closer to woodland (Figs. 4 and S10). Conversely bee decline was stronger in meadows closer to woodland.

264

265 3.2 | Butterflies

The abundance of butterflies declined in field crops and vineyards and increased in meadows (Tables 2 and S3). Declines were related to farming intensity, but in opposite ways: as with bees, the trend in field crops was negatively correlated with the use of pesticides or mineral fertilization (Figs. 2 and S8). Conversely, the decline in vineyards was stronger in fields with fewer pesticide applications. No temporal trend was identifiable in orchards, but sample size was small (*N*=213 for 37 fields).

271

272 **3.3 | Earthworms**

The abundance of earthworms showed a temporal decline in meadows only that did not vary with practices or landscape (no significant interactions, Tables 3 and S4, Figs. 3 and S9). However, the abundance of earthworms was significantly and positively related to a reduced tillage in field crops, as well as to organic fertilization and meadow age in meadows.

278 The abundance of beetles increased significantly in field crops and vineyards and decreased in

279 meadows and orchards (Tables 4 and S5). Declines in meadows and orchards were stronger in fields

280 with more mineral fertilization (or pesticides in orchards, effects are difficult to separate) (Figs. 3 and

281 S9). Finally, the decline in meadows was detected in temporary but not in permanent grasslands,

282 where we observed a stronger increase in fields with more organic fertilization.

283

284 3.5 | Molluscs

As with beetles, the abundance of molluscs increased significantly in field crops and vineyards and

decreased in meadows and orchards (Tables 5 and S6). Increases in vineyards were stronger in fields

287 with more mineral fertilization or pesticides (effects are difficult to separate) but less organic

288 fertilization. Declines in meadows were stronger in fields with more organic fertilization and in

temporary versus permanent meadows (Figs. 3 and S9).

290

291 **4 | Discussion**

292 In this study we documented significant correlations between temporal trends in biodiversity abundance and in-field agricultural practices or wider landscape variables, across the whole of France 293 294 thanks to participation of farmers in citizen science. In the following, we first compare our results 295 with the existing literature using professionally collected data, contrasting flying versus soil taxa, and 296 discuss the possible limitations related to the participatory nature of the data. We then examine how 297 citizen science engaging farmers in monitoring of biodiversity can help pinpoint possible levers for 298 the conservation and even restoration of invertebrates in agroecosystems through modifications of 299 farming practices.

300

302 4.1 | Worrying temporal trends in abundance for several invertebrates monitored in FBO are

303 related with agricultural practices

304 Of the five groups monitored, we observed a general negative trend in abundances, in particular for 305 the two flying taxa with relatively long-distance movements (butterflies and solitary bees). These 306 findings are in line with recent studies showing a decline in bees and butterflies, whether on a local 307 (Hallmann et al., 2019), regional (Habel, Trusch, Schmitt, Ochse, & Ulrich, 2019), national (Dooren, 308 2019) or global scale (Klink et al., 2020; Sánchez-Bayo & Wyckhuys, 2019). Soil taxa, including 309 potentially flying species but with short-distance daily movements, such as beetles, show a more 310 mixed picture, with a temporal decline in abundance in meadows and orchards but a more surprising 311 increase in field crops and vineyards. One major question is whether these trends reflect true 312 variations in arthropod abundance in farmland, or are partly caused by temporal changes in the 313 sample of fields surveyed each year, owing to the turnover of FBO participants. Two points discard 314 the latter explanation. First, the general trend in abundance was negative, which could have been 315 caused by a temporal increase in the fraction of fields under intensive farming in the FBO sample. 316 Yet, if anything, the tendency in the FBO sample is that of an increase in the fraction of fields under 317 organic farming consistent with the national trend (Note S1). Second, we did not analyze trends on 318 raw data, but in a model including interactions with farming practices or landscape, thereby 319 controlling for temporal changes in the latter variables.

Our ability to relate temporal trends in biodiversity with local agricultural practices contrasts with most previous studies. Our results are generally consistent however with numerous smaller-scale studies using the SFT assumption: stronger declines in fields with more synthetic inputs (mineral fertilization and pesticides) or in more homogeneous landscapes in most cases, but with some exceptions. Fertilization affects habitat quality via enrichment and sorting of competitive plant species. This may reduce the diversity and amounts of food for pollinating insects (e.g. bees and butterflies in field crops) and phytophagous species (e.g. molluscs in meadows). In some cases, however, increased plant biomass and leaf nitrogen content associated with fertilization can result in
 increased invertebrate abundance, as observed e.g. by Haddad, Haarstad, & Tilman (2000) and in
 several instances in FBO: for molluscs with mineral fertilization in vineyards, as well as for bees and
 beetles with organic fertilization in meadows.

331 Pesticides often have non-target negative effects on invertebrates, demonstrated in the lab 332 (Desneux, Decourtye, & Delpuech, 2007; Henry et al., 2012; Mulé, Sabella, Robba, & Manachini, 333 2017) or in fields (Mulé et al., 2017), through direct mortality or multiple sublethal effects (Brittain & 334 Potts, 2011; Desneux et al., 2007). Such effects may explain the negative relationship observed 335 between pesticide use and trends in abundance of bees and butterflies in field crops. We found a 336 more surprising positive correlation with butterfly abundance trends in vineyards. This is consistent 337 with Muratet & Fontaine (2015) who observed the same positive relationship in gardens with 338 fungicides and Bordeaux mixture - two products highly used in vineyards - on butterflies and 339 bumblebees. A hypothesis would be that plants protected from pests allocate more resources to 340 nectar production.

Finally, proximity to woodland has mixed effects on solitary bees. The positive effect in vineyards is in line with numerous studies such as Carrié, Andrieu, Ouin, & Steffan-Dewenter (2017). For some bee species, semi-natural landscape elements such as forests provide nesting sites and long-lasting food sources (Hopfenmüller, Steffan-Dewenter, & Holzschuh, 2014) as well as a high connectivity in the landscape. Decline of bee abundance in meadows close to woodland is consistent with Winfree, Griswold, & Kremen (2007) and may be explained by the lower quality of forests vs. farmland for bee species that are likely specialists of open habitats.

Although these results corroborate previous knowledge and go beyond by relating biodiversity trends with in-field practices, this approach suffers some limitations, some of which are inherent to citizen science. As in many studies, including professional ones, our results are correlative and do not formally demonstrate a causal relationship between agricultural practices or surrounding landscape 352 and biodiversity. For example, a positive relationship between pesticide use and abundance of soil 353 taxa may arise because pest outbreaks trigger pesticide use, which we are not able to differentiate 354 from a positive effect of pesticides on these groups. This limitation could be partly overcome with 355 time and a higher fidelity of participants: with longer time series, the dataset would contain a larger 356 number of events of changes in practices. Such events could be used to analyse in more detail the 357 impact of changing practices on biodiversity in real time, in an experimental-like manner. Second, the 358 effects of pesticides and mineral fertilization were often not distinguishable from each other. This is 359 related to the first point: across farming systems, pesticide and fertilizer uses are strongly correlated 360 with each other. This multicollinearity undermines our ability to differentiate the relative 361 contribution of each practice, a problem that could be partly alleviated again by real-time monitoring 362 of changes in practices. Another option would be to collect higher resolution data on chemical 363 products used (date and mode of application, quantity...), beyond a mere number of applications. 364 Finally, data collection by non-taxonomists implies that in most cases, specimens could not be 365 identified to species level. This may hamper our understanding of the ecological mechanisms 366 influencing abundance trends in broad taxonomic groups containing species with contrasting 367 ecological preferences. For example, some groups could be dominated by a single successful species. 368 Alternatively, landscape may matter for some large but relatively rare ground beetles, but mixing 369 them with smaller species with limited dispersal ability masked possible correlations with landscape 370 structure.

371

4.2 | Promising levers for invertebrate conservation in agricultural landscapes

Our study pinpoints two key levers for invertebrate conservation in agroecosystems: i) identification
of practices that may restore biodiversity ii) involvement of farmers in biodiversity monitoring;
farmers are the main, albeit not the sole, social group with impacts on farmland biodiversity, and
they have the agency to change practices.

377 Despite the above limitations, this study illustrates that citizen science can be a powerful tool to 378 gather extensive ecological datasets allowing research at multiple spatio-temporal scales and the 379 identification of levers for invertebrate conservation. Although collected via simplified sampling 380 protocols, the data make it possible to detect temporal trends in total abundance of several 381 understudied taxonomic groups and interactions with other variables. This confirms that well-382 designed participatory science adds value to large-scale biodiversity studies (Chandler et al., 2017; 383 McKinley et al., 2017) and allows the development of indicators (Couvet, Jiguet, Julliard, Levrel, & 384 Teyssedre, 2008). Such design could also be used to foster arthropod conservation in farmland, 385 which is crucial for ethical and economic reasons (FAO, 2019). Below we show that our results 386 converge with <u>Habel</u>, <u>Samways</u>, <u>& Schmitt (2019</u>) recommendations for a European strategy 387 mitigating the decline of terrestrial insects, including the protection of high quality habitats for 388 insects, ecological intensification of agriculture and the reduction and control of fertilizers and 389 pesticides.

390 As discussed above, promoting participant fidelity to track the consequences of changes in farming 391 practices should help separate the effects of pesticides versus fertilizers and identify biodiversity-392 friendly practices with demonstrated causative effects. Improved fidelity can be achieved by developing more user-friendly data entry interfaces, by promoting FBO in large professional 393 394 networks, such as unions, or by providing more personalized feedback to participants, all of which is 395 under way. We may also hope to see more changes in practices as a result of recent political will to 396 reduce pesticides use or of awareness raising through participatory science (Deguines, Princé, Prévot, 397 & Fontaine, 2020).

Beyond the reduction of inputs, our results also suggest that arthropod conservation can be
promoted via improved habitat quality, e.g. presence of old meadows or woodland. For example, we
observed that the decline of beetles and molluscs in temporary meadows could be reversed,

401 depending on management, in permanent meadows. This corroborates the recognized importance of
 402 permanent grasslands for biodiversity (Petters, 2015).

Finally, Habel, Samways, & Schmitt (2019) also stressed the society's relationship to insects and the 403 404 need to highlight their economic and ecological importance to help raise public awareness. One of 405 the distinctives of FBO as a citizen science object is that it is aimed at a specific socio-professional 406 public. The involvement of farmers in farmland biodiversity monitoring may help them acknowledge 407 the need to take biodiversity into account in their professional practice and transform their vision of 408 their farm (Deschamps & Demeulenaere, 2015; Hampartzoumian et al., 2013). Participatory science 409 through an experience-based knowledge and sharing through professional networks (McKinley et al., 410 2017) could be a driving force for change in agricultural practices at the farmers' scale. By providing 411 data directly from their fields and practices (as opposed to experimental conditions), farmers took an 412 active role in the demonstration of the effects of agriculture on its environment, which may elicit 413 citizen involvement. Furthermore, engagement in citizen science could launch interactions between 414 farmers and scientists to work together on new agricultural systems (Berthet, Barnaud, Girard, 415 Labatut, & Martin, 2016). Finally, FBO tends to serve as an exchange platform between 416 environmentalists/naturalists and farming professionals. The program is therefore becoming a 417 political tool for agro-ecological transition, soon providing indicators for public management and 418 hopefully contributing in a compelling way, as an output of citizen science, to the scientific warning 419 messages on the biodiversity crisis.

420

421 Acknowledgments

We thank all farmers who provided observations from their fields, the FBO management team
(Elodie Chauvet, Marion Demade, Marine Gérardin, Romain Julliard, Christophe Pinard, Nora
Rouillier) and the French Ministry of Agriculture, which supported the program. We acknowledge the
E-OBS dataset from the EU-FP6 project UERRA (http://www.uerra.eu), the Copernicus Climate

426	Change Service,	and the data	providers in the ECA&D	project	(https://www.ecad.eu). We thank the
-----	-----------------	--------------	------------------------	---------	----------------------	-----------------

427 INRAE MIGALE bioinformatics facility (MIGALE, INRAE, 2020. Migale bioinformatics Facility, doi:

428 10.15454/1.5572390655343293E12) for providing help and support. This research project was

429 funded by the Crédit Agricole through sponsoring to OB. Finally, we thank Michael Pocock and two

430 anonymous reviewers for constructive comments on an earlier version of this article.

431

432 Authors' contributions

- 433 EP, RLV and OB conceived the ideas and designed methodology; OB analysed the data; EP and OB led
- the writing of the manuscript. All authors contributed critically to the drafts and gave final approval
- 435 for publication.

436 Data availability statement

437 Data is available from Zenodo (Billaud, Vermeersch, & Porcher, 2020)

438 References

- 439 Berger, G., Graef, F., Pallut, B., Hoffmann, J., Brühl, C. A., & Wagner, N. (2018). How Does Changing
- 440 Pesticide Usage Over Time Affect Migrating Amphibians: A Case Study on the Use of
- 441 Glyphosate-Based Herbicides in German Agriculture Over 20 Years. *Frontiers in*
- 442 Environmental Science, 6. doi: 10.3389/fenvs.2018.00006
- 443 Berthet, E. T. A., Barnaud, C., Girard, N., Labatut, J., & Martin, G. (2016). How to foster agroecological
- 444 innovations? A comparison of participatory design methods. *Journal of Environmental*

445 *Planning and Management, 59*(2), 280–301. doi: 10.1080/09640568.2015.1009627

- Billaud, O., Vermeersch, R.-L., & Porcher, E. (2020). Data Citizen science involving farmers as a
- 447 means to document temporal trends in farmland biodiversity and relate them to agricultural
- 448 practices. [Data set]. Zenodo. doi: 10.5281/zenodo.3903128

449	Bolker, B. M., Brooks, M. E., Clark, C. J., Geange, S. W., Poulsen, J. R., Stevens, M. H. H., & White, JS.
450	S. (2009). Generalized linear mixed models: a practical guide for ecology and evolution.
451	Trends in Ecology & Evolution, 24(3), 127–135. doi: 10.1016/j.tree.2008.10.008
452	Bouché, M. B. (1972). Lombriciens de France: écologie et systématique. Paris, France: Institut national
453	de la recherche agronomique.
454	Brittain, C., & Potts, S. G. (2011). The potential impacts of insecticides on the life-history traits of bees
455	and the consequences for pollination. <i>Basic and Applied Ecology</i> , 12(4), 321–331. doi:
456	10.1016/j.baae.2010.12.004
457	Cardinale, B. J., Matulich, K. L., Hooper, D. U., Byrnes, J. E., Duffy, E., Gamfeldt, L., Gonzalez, A.
458	(2011). The Functional Role of Producer Diversity in Ecosystems. American Journal of Botany,
459	<i>98</i> (3), 572–592. doi: 10.3732/ajb.1000364
460	Carrié, R., Andrieu, E., Ouin, A., & Steffan-Dewenter, I. (2017). Interactive effects of landscape-wide
461	intensity of farming practices and landscape complexity on wild bee diversity. Landscape
462	<i>Ecology</i> , <i>32</i> (8), 1631–1642. doi: 10.1007/s10980-017-0530-y
463	Chandler, M., See, L., Copas, K., Bonde, A. M. Z., López, B. C., Danielsen, F., Turak, E. (2017).
464	Contribution of citizen science towards international biodiversity monitoring. Biological
465	Conservation, 213, 280–294. doi: 10.1016/j.biocon.2016.09.004

- 466 Cornes, R. C., Schrier, G. van der, Besselaar, E. J. M. van den, & Jones, P. D. (2018). An Ensemble
- Version of the E-OBS Temperature and Precipitation Data Sets. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, *123*(17), 9391–9409. doi: 10.1029/2017JD028200

469 Couvet, D., Jiguet, F., Julliard, R., Levrel, H., & Teyssedre, A. (2008). Enhancing citizen contributions to

470 biodiversity science and public policy. *Interdisciplinary Science Reviews*, 33(1), 95–103. doi:

471 10.1179/030801808X260031

472 Damgaard, C. (2019). A Critique of the Space-for-Time Substitution Practice in Community Ecology.

473 *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, 34(5), 416–421. doi: 10.1016/j.tree.2019.01.013

- Deguines, N., Princé, K., Prévot, A.-C., & Fontaine, B. (2020). Assessing the emergence of pro-474
- 475 biodiversity practices in citizen scientists of a backyard butterfly survey. Science of The Total Environment, 716, 136842. doi: 10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.136842 476
- Deschamps, S., & Demeulenaere, É. (2015). L'observatoire agricole de la biodiversité. Vers un ré-477
- 478 ancrage des pratiques dans leur milieu. Études rurales, (195), 109–126.
- 479 Desneux, N., Decourtye, A., & Delpuech, J.-M. (2007). The Sublethal Effects of Pesticides on Beneficial 480 Arthropods. Annual Review of Entomology, 52(1), 81–106. doi:
- 481 10.1146/annurev.ento.52.110405.091440
- 482 Dooren, T. J. M. V. (2019). Assessing species richness trends: Declines of bees and bumblebees in the
- 483 Netherlands since 1945. Ecology and Evolution, 9(23), 13056–13068. doi: 10.1002/ece3.5717
- Dover, J., & Settele, J. (2009). The influences of landscape structure on butterfly distribution and 484
- 485 movement: a review. Journal of Insect Conservation, 13(1), 3–27. doi: 10.1007/s10841-008-9135-8
- 486
- 487 FAO. (2019). The State of the World's Biodiversity for Food and Agriculture. Retrieved from
- 488 http://www.fao.org/3/CA3229EN/CA3229EN.pdf
- 489 Gamez-Virues, S., Perovic, D. J., Gossner, M. M., Boersching, C., Bluethgen, N., de Jong, H., ...
- 490 Westphal, C. (2015). Landscape simplification filters species traits and drives biotic homogenization. Nature Communications, 6, 8568. doi: 10.1038/ncomms9568 491
- 492 Habel, J. C., Samways, M. J., & Schmitt, T. (2019). Mitigating the precipitous decline of terrestrial

493 European insects: Requirements for a new strategy. Biodiversity and Conservation, 28(6),

- 1343–1360. doi: 10.1007/s10531-019-01741-8 494
- 495 Habel, J. C., Trusch, R., Schmitt, T., Ochse, M., & Ulrich, W. (2019). Long-term large-scale decline in
- 496 relative abundances of butterfly and burnet moth species across south-western Germany.

Scientific Reports, *9*(1), 1–9. doi: 10.1038/s41598-019-51424-1 497

- 498 Haddad, N. M., Haarstad, J., & Tilman, D. (2000). The effects of long-term nitrogen loading on
- 499 grassland insect communities. Oecologia, 124(1), 73-84. doi: 10.1007/s004420050026

500	Halimann, C. A., Foppen, R. P. B., Van Turnnout, C. A. M., de Kroon, H., & Jongejans, E. (2014).
501	Declines in insectivorous birds are associated with high neonicotinoid concentrations.
502	Nature, 511(7509), 341–343. doi: 10.1038/nature13531
503	Hallmann, C. A., Sorg, M., Jongejans, E., Siepel, H., Hofland, N., Schwan, H., de Kroon, H. (2017).
504	More than 75 percent decline over 27 years in total flying insect biomass in protected areas
505	PLOS ONE, 12(10), e0185809. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0185809
506	Hallmann, C. A., Zeegers, T., Klink, R. van, Vermeulen, R., Wielink, P. van, Spijkers, H., Jongejans, E

- 507 (2019). Declining abundance of beetles, moths and caddisflies in the Netherlands. *Insect* 508 *Conservation and Diversity*, *13*(2), 127–139. doi: 10.1111/icad.12377
- Hampartzoumian, H., Preud'Homme, R.-L., Loïs, G., Raymond, R., Bühler, È. A., & Hanachi, Y. (2013).
- 510 L'Observatoire agricole de la biodiversité (OAB) : une pédagogie active autour d'un projet de
- 511 sciences participatives. *Pour, 219*(3), 169. doi: 10.3917/pour.219.0169
- 512 Hartig, F. (2020). DHARMa: Residual Diagnostics for Hierarchical (Multi-Level / Mixed) Regression
- 513 *Models. R package version 0.3.2.0.* Retrieved from https://CRAN.R-
- 514 project.org/package=DHARMa
- 515 Henry, M., Beguin, M., Requier, F., Rollin, O., Odoux, J.-F., Aupinel, P., ... Decourtye, A. (2012). A
- 516 Common Pesticide Decreases Foraging Success and Survival in Honey Bees. Science,
- 517 *336*(6079), 348–350. doi: 10.1126/science.1215039
- 518 Hopfenmüller, S., Steffan-Dewenter, I., & Holzschuh, A. (2014). Trait-Specific Responses of Wild Bee
- 519 Communities to Landscape Composition, Configuration and Local Factors. *PLoS ONE*, *9*(8).
- 520 doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0104439
- Jackson, S. T., & Blois, J. L. (2015). Community ecology in a changing environment: Perspectives from
- 522 the Quaternary. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *112*(16), 4915–4921. doi:
- 523 10.1073/pnas.1403664111

- 524 Klink, R. van, Bowler, D. E., Gongalsky, K. B., Swengel, A. B., Gentile, A., & Chase, J. M. (2020). Meta-
- analysis reveals declines in terrestrial but increases in freshwater insect abundances. *Science*, *368*(6489), 417–420. doi: 10.1126/science.aax9931
- 527 Kratz, T. K., Deegan, L. A., Harmon, M. E., & Lauenroth, W. K. (2003). Ecological Variability in Space
- 528 and Time: Insights Gained from the US LTER Program. *BioScience*, 53(1), 57–67. doi:
- 529 10.1641/0006-3568(2003)053[0057:EVISAT]2.0.CO;2
- 530 Kromp, B. (1999). Carabid beetles in sustainable agriculture: a review on pest control efficacy,
- 531 cultivation impacts and enhancement. *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment*, 74(1–3), 187–
 532 228. doi: 10.1016/S0167-8809(99)00037-7
- Lemtiri, A., Colinet, G., Alabi, T., Cluzeau, D., Zirbes, L., Haubruge, E., & Francis, F. (2014). Impacts of
- earthworms on soil components and dynamics. A review. *Biotechnologie Agronomie Societe Et Environnement*, *18*(1), 121–133.
- Lüdecke, D. (2018). ggeffects: Tidy Data Frames of Marginal Effects from Regression Models. *Journal* of Open Source Software, 3(26), 772. doi: 10.21105/joss.00772
- 538 Lüdecke, D., Makowski, D., Waggoner, P., & Patil, I. (2020). Assessment of Regression Models

539 *Performance*. Retrieved from https://easystats.github.io/performance

- 540 McKinley, D. C., Miller-Rushing, A. J., Ballard, H. L., Bonney, R., Brown, H., Cook-Patton, S. C., ...
- 541 Soukup, M. A. (2017). Citizen science can improve conservation science, natural resource
- 542 management, and environmental protection. *Biological Conservation*, 208, 15–28. doi:
- 543 10.1016/j.biocon.2016.05.015
- 544 Mulé, R., Sabella, G., Robba, L., & Manachini, B. (2017). Systematic Review of the Effects of Chemical
- 545 Insecticides on Four Common Butterfly Families. *Frontiers in Environmental Science*, 5. doi:
- 546 10.3389/fenvs.2017.00032
- 547 Muratet, A., & Fontaine, B. (2015). Contrasting impacts of pesticides on butterflies and bumblebees

548 in private gardens in France. *Biological Conservation*, *182*, 148–154. doi:

549 10.1016/j.biocon.2014.11.045

550	Nakagawa, S., Johnson, P. C. D., & Schielzeth, H. (2017). The coefficient of determination R2 and
551	intra-class correlation coefficient from generalized linear mixed-effects models revisited and
552	expanded. Journal of The Royal Society Interface, 14(134), 20170213. doi:
553	10.1098/rsif.2017.0213
554	Nilsson, S. G., Franzen, M., & Pettersson, L. B. (2013). Land-use changes, farm management and the
555	decline of butterflies associated with semi-natural grasslands in southern Sweden. Nature
556	Conservation-Bulgaria, (6), 31–48. doi: 10.3897/natureconservation.6.5205
557	Pereira, H. M., Ferrier, S., Walters, M., Geller, G. N., Jongman, R. H. G., Scholes, R. J., Wegmann, M.
558	(2013). Essential Biodiversity Variables. Science, 339(6117), 277–278. doi:
559	10.1126/science.1229931
560	Petters, A. (2015). Environmental impacts and future challenges of grasslands and grasslandbased
561	livestock production systems in Europe. In P. K. Ghosh, S. K. Mahanta, J. B. Singh, & P. S.
562	Pathak (Eds.), Grassland : a global ressource perspective (International Grassland Congress
563	and Range Management Society of IndiaArmy Printing Press, pp. 365–390). Lucknow, India:
564	Army Printing Press.
565	Pickett, S. T. A. (1989). Space-for-Time Substitution as an Alternative to Long-Term Studies. In G. E.
566	Likens (Ed.), Long-Term Studies in Ecology: Approaches and Alternatives (pp. 110–135). New
567	York, NY: Springer New York. doi: 10.1007/978-1-4615-7358-6_5
568	Ponge, JF., Pérès, G., Guernion, M., Ruiz-Camacho, N., Cortet, J., Pernin, C., Cluzeau, D. (2013).
569	The impact of agricultural practices on soil biota: A regional study. Soil Biology and
570	Biochemistry, 67, 271–284. doi: 10.1016/j.soilbio.2013.08.026
571	Potts, S. G., Imperatriz-Fonseca, V., Ngo, H. T., Aizen, M. A., Biesmeijer, J. C., Breeze, T. D.,
572	Vanbergen, A. J. (2016). Safeguarding pollinators and their values to human well-being.
573	Nature, 540(7632), 220–229. doi: 10.1038/nature20588

Roger-Estrade, J., Anger, C., Bertrand, M., & Richard, G. (2010). Tillage and soil ecology: Partners for
sustainable agriculture. *Soil and Tillage Research*, *111*(1), 33–40. doi:

576 10.1016/j.still.2010.08.010

- Sánchez-Bayo, F., & Wyckhuys, K. A. G. (2019). Worldwide decline of the entomofauna: A review of
 its drivers. *Biological Conservation*, *232*, 8–27. doi: 10.1016/j.biocon.2019.01.020
- 579 Schmucki, R. (2020). *climateExtract: Extract Climate Data From a Local NETCDF File. R package*580 version 1.18.0.
- 581 Seibold, S., Gossner, M. M., Simons, N. K., Blüthgen, N., Müller, J., Ambarli, D., ... Weisser, W. W.
- 582 (2019). Arthropod decline in grasslands and forests is associated with landscape-level drivers.

583 *Nature*, *574*(7780), 671–674. doi: 10.1038/s41586-019-1684-3

- 584 Stanton, R. L., Morrissey, C. A., & Clark, R. G. (2018). Analysis of trends and agricultural drivers of
- farmland bird declines in North America: A review. *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment, 254*, 244–254. doi: 10.1016/j.agee.2017.11.028
- 587 Symondson, W. O. C., Sunderland, K. D., & Greenstone, M. H. (2002). Can generalist predators be

588 effective biocontrol agents? *Annual Review of Entomology*, 47, 561–594. doi:

- 589 10.1146/annurev.ento.47.091201.145240
- 590 Voeten, C. C. (2020). buildmer: Stepwise Elimination and Term Reordering for Mixed-Effects
- 591 *Regression. R package version 1.6.* Retrieved from https://CRAN.R-
- 592 project.org/package=buildmer
- 593 Winfree, R., Griswold, T., & Kremen, C. (2007). Effect of Human Disturbance on Bee Communities in a
- 594 Forested Ecosystem. *Conservation Biology*, 21(1), 213–223. doi: 10.1111/j.1523-
- 595 1739.2006.00574.x
- 596 Winfree, R., Williams, N. M., Dushoff, J., & Kremen, C. (2007). Native bees provide insurance against

597 ongoing honey bee losses. *Ecology Letters*, 10(11), 1105–1113. doi: 10.1111/j.1461-

598 0248.2007.01110.x

- 599 Zaller, J. G., & Brühl, C. A. (2019). Editorial: Non-target Effects of Pesticides on Organisms Inhabiting
- 600 Agroecosystems. *Frontiers in Environmental Science*, 7. doi: 10.3389/fenvs.2019.00075

602 Table 1. Results of the GLMM models on abundance of solitary bees for each crop type, using the 603 PCA coordinates as proxy for farming practices and the MCA coordinates as proxy for landscape characteristics. PCA axis 1 stands for chemical treatment and axis 2 for organic fertilization in field 604 605 crops, vineyards and orchards (Fig.1 C-D-F), while the reverse is true in meadows. The first axis of 606 MCA represents proximity to woodland; the interpretation of the second axis is more variable (see 607 main text and Fig. S4-5-6-7). Values are log-coefficients, followed by their significance (stars). 608 Marginal and conditional R² give the variance explained by the model with and without the random "field" effect of the model (with variance σ^2). 609

Bees	Field crops	Meadows	Vineyards	Orchards
Year, landscape, practices				
Year	-0.21 ***	-0.13	0.05	-0.38 **
MCA1	0.24 ***	0.19	0.07	0.34
MCA2	n/a	-0.34 ***	-0.22 *	-0.13
PCA1	-0.16 *	0.22 *	0.16	0.15
PCA2	-0.21 **	n/a	n/a	-0.67 ***
Meadows' use: Mix	n/a	0.29	n/a	n/a
Meadows' use: Pasture	n/a	-0.73 ***	n/a	n/a
Inter-rows: Partly grassy	n/a	n/a	-0.05	n/a
Inter-rows: Bare	n/a	n/a	-0.76 **	n/a
Interactions				_
Year*PCA1	-0.28 ***	0.22 *	n/a	-0.38 **
Year*PCA2	0.15 *	n/a	n/a	n/a
Year * MCA1	n/a	-0.19 *	0.24 ***	-0.27 *
Year * MCA2	n/a	n/a	-0.16 *	0.37 **
Covariates				
Degree days	2.05 ***	2.54 ***	2.50 ***	2.13 ***
Degree days ²	-1.26 ***	-1.74 ***	-1.63 ***	-1.57 ***
Longitude	0.40 ***	0.37 ***	0.39 **	0.57 ***
Latitude	-0.42 ***	-0.20	n/a	n/a
Vegetation height	0.26 ***	n/a	0.13 *	n/a
Installation date	-0.11 *	-0.32 ***	-0.19 *	-0.26
σ^2	3.73	2.68	2.79	2.98
Marginal R ² / Conditional R ²	0.223 / 0.839	0.289 / 0.829	0.238 / 0.801	0.306 / 0.829

610

*p<0.05 **p<0.01 ***p<0.001

611

- 613 **Table 2.** Results of the GLMM models on abundance of butterflies for each crop type, using the PCA
- 614 coordinates as proxy for farming practices. PCA, MCA axes and all symbols as in Table 1.

Butterflies	Field crops	Meadows	Vineyards	Orchards
Year, landscape, practices				
Year	-0.05	0.19 ***	-0.14 *	n/a
MCA1	n/a	-0.18 **	n/a	n/a
MCA2	n/a	-0.13	n/a	n/a
PCA1	0.01	n/a	n/a	n/a
Inter-rows: Partly grassy	n/a	n/a	-0.16	n/a
Inter-rows: Bare	n/a	n/a	-0.79 ***	n/a
Interactions				
Year*PCA1	-0.09 *	n/a	n/a	n/a
Year *MCA2	n/a	0.14 **	n/a	n/a
Covariates				
Degree days	1.69 ***	1.31 ***	0.94 ***	1.80 ***
Degree days ²	-1.51 ***	-1.23 ***	-1.02 ***	-1.77 ***
Latitude	-0.18 ***	-0.29 ***	-0.38 ***	n/a
Longitude	n/a	n/a	0.24 **	n/a
Cloud cover: Sunny	0.59 ***	0.70 ***	0.4	n/a
Cloud cover: Slightly cloudy	0.53 ***	0.45 *	0.54	n/a
Cloud cover: Thin overcast	0.43 **	0.94 ***	0.58	n/a
Cloud cover: Cloudy	0.35 **	0.47 *	0.13	n/a
Cloud cover: Very cloudy	0.08	-0.18	-0.64	n/a
Wind: Light	0.56 ***	0.46 **	n/a	n/a
Wind: No	0.67 ***	0.26	n/a	n/a
σ^2	0.46	0.43	0.67	0.4
Marginal R ² / Conditional R ²	0.262 / 0.601	0.252 / 0.566	0.243 / 0.707	0.188 / 0.529

*p<0.05 **p<0.01 ***p<0.001

615

- **Table 3.** Results of the GLM models on abundance of earthworms for each crop type, using the PCA
- 618 coordinates as proxy for farming practices. PCA, MCA axes and all symbols as in Table 1.

Earthworms	Field crops	Meadows
Year, landscape, practices		_
Year	n/a	-0.26 ***
PCA1	n/a	0.18 **
Tillage: Deep ploughing	-0.28 *	n/a
Tillage: Direct sowing	0.81 ***	n/a
Meadow's age	n/a	0.26 ***
Covariates		
Degree days	-0.13 *	-0.13 *
Soil humidity: Waterlogged	0.56	-1.58 **
Soil humidity: Wet	-0.09	-0.67
Soil humidity: Dried	0.06	0.27
Soil humidity: Dry	-0.69 *	-0.35
* p<0.05	** p<0.01	*** p<0.001

- **Table 4.** Results of the GLMM models on abundance of beetles for each crop type, using the PCA
- 622 coordinates as proxy for farming practices. PCA, MCA axes and all symbols as in Table 1.

Beetles	Field crops	Meadows	Vineyards	Orchards
Year, landscape, practices				
Year	0.24 ***	-0.28 *	0.29 ***	-0.93 ***
PCA1	0.18 ***	0.58 ***	0.20 *	0.88 ***
PCA2	-0.04	0.34 *	n/a	n/a
Meadows' type: Permanent	n/a	-0.15	n/a	n/a
Interactions				
Year*PCA1	n/a	-0.37 **	n/a	-0.49 ***
Year*PCA2	0.17 ***	0.30 *	n/a	n/a
Year*(Meadows' type: Permanent)	n/a	0.80 ***	n/a	n/a
Covariates				
Degree days	n/a	-0.14 ***	-0.25 ***	-0.20 ***
Degree days ²	-0.10 ***	n/a	n/a	n/a
Latitude	0.22 ***	n/a	0.62 ***	n/a
Installation date	n/a	-0.34 **	0.22 *	n/a
Board humidity: Dried	-0.36 ***	n/a	0.61 ***	-0.20
Board humidity: Dry	-0.45 ***	n/a	0.68 ***	0.47 *
σ^2	1.21	1.83	1.70	1.60
Marginal R ² / Conditional R ²	0.069 / 0.594	0.124 / 0.711	0.127 / 0.472	0.169 / 0.750

*p<0.05 **p<0.01 ***p<0.001

Table 5. Results of the GLMM models on abundance of molluscs for each crop type, using the PCA

627 coordinates as proxy for farming practices. PCA, MCA axes and all symbols as in Table 1.

Mollusks	Field crops	Meadows	Vineyards	Orchards		
Year, landscape, practices						
Year	0.50 ***	-0.43 ***	0.15 *	-0.14 *		
MCA2	0.09 ***	n/a	n/a	n/a		
PCA1	-0.01	0.09	0.18	0.34 *		
PCA2	0.07	0.17	-0.14	-0.17 **		
Tillage: Deep ploughing	-0.04	n/a	n/a	n/a		
Tillage: Direct sowing	0.52 **	n/a	n/a	n/a		
Inter-rows: Partly grassy	n/a	n/a	0.29	0.29		
Inter-rows: Bare	n/a	n/a	-0.85 **	-1.13 ***		
Meadows' type: Permanent	n/a	0.11	n/a	n/a		
Meadows' use: Mix	n/a	-0.45 **	n/a	n/a		
Meadows' use: Pasture	n/a	0.32	n/a	n/a		
Interactions						
Year*PCA1	0.10 *	-0.67 ***	0.22 **	-0.17 *		
Year*PCA2	-0.27 ****	0.35 ***	-0.35 ***	n/a		
Year*(Tillage: Deep ploughing)	-0.19 *	n/a	n/a	n/a		
Year*(Tillage: Direct sowing)	0.12	n/a	n/a	n/a		
Year*(Meadows' use: Mix)	n/a	0.32 *	n/a	n/a		
Year*(Meadows' use: Pasture)	n/a	0.03	n/a	n/a		
Year*(Meadows' type: Permanent)	n/a	0.91 ***	n/a	n/a		
Covariates						
Degree days	-0.70 ****	-1.06 ***	-0.48 ***	-0.75 ***		
Degree days ²	0.60 ***	0.84 ***	0.45 ***	0.52 ***		
Longitude	n/a	n/a	0.42 **	n/a		
Board humidity: Dried	-0.05	-0.30 ***	0.15	n/a		
Board humidity: Dry	-0.46 ***	-0.42 ***	-0.30 **	n/a		
Board soil: Grassy	0.19 **	n/a	0.29 **	n/a		
σ²	1.12	0.82	1.03	0.80		
Marginal R ² / Conditional R ²	0.163 / 0.641	0.227 / 0.769	0.116 / 0.728	0.112 / 0.745		
* p<0.05 ** p<0.01 *** p<0.001						



Figure 1. Principal Component Analysis on farming practices over all crop types (A-B) or within crop types (C orchards, D field crops, E meadows, F vineyards). Panels A and C-F show the correlation circles, with the fraction of variance explained by the first two axes. Abbreviations: H herbicide, F fungicide, I insecticide, M molluscicide, OP other pesticides, MF mineral fertilization, OF organic fertilization, OA organic amendment, CA calcium amendment. Panel B shows the distribution of the fields with different crop types along the two axes.



Figure 2. Relationship between synthetic inputs (pesticide and mineral fertilization use) and temporal
trends in butterfly (A) and bee (B) abundance in field crops. Use of synthetic inputs is characterized
here by the coordinates of the first PCA axis (Fig. 1D), from high levels (red line: mean plus one
standard deviation), through medium levels (orange line: mean) to low values (yellow line: mean
minus one standard deviation). Other variables are at their mean (quantitative terms) or
representative levels (qualitative terms).



Figure 3. Relationship between organic fertilization and temporal trends in meadows. Organic
fertilization is characterized here by the coordinates of the first PCA axis (Fig. 1E), from high levels
(dark blue line: mean plus one standard deviation), through medium levels (blue line: mean) to low
values (light blue line: mean minus one standard deviation). Other variables are at their mean
(quantitative terms) or representative levels (qualitative terms). Beetle and mollusk abundance are
predicted in permanent (C-E) and temporary meadows (D-F).





Figure 4. Relationship between landscape (woodland proximity) and temporal trends in bee
abundance in vineyards (A) and meadows (B). Woodland proximity is characterized here by the
coordinates of the first MCA axis (Fig. S4), from high levels (dark green line: mean plus one standard
deviation), through medium levels (green line: mean) to low values (light green line: mean minus one
standard deviation). Other variables are at their mean (quantitative terms) or representative levels
(qualitative terms). Predicts are computed from models using the PCA as proxy for practices.