#### **ORIGINAL PAPER**



# **The suitability of sown wildfower strips as hunting grounds for spider‑hunting wasps of the genus** *Trypoxylon* **depends on landscape context**

UtaSophie Hoffmann<sup>1,2</sup> • Frank Jauker<sup>2</sup> · Eva Diehl<sup>2</sup> · Viktoria Mader<sup>2</sup> · Daniela Fiedler<sup>2,3</sup> · Volkmar Wolters<sup>2</sup> · **Tim Diekötter1,2**

Received: 8 March 2019 / Accepted: 21 October 2019 / Published online: 29 October 2019 © Springer Nature Switzerland AG 2019

#### **Abstract**

Subsidized wildfower strips aim at counteracting insect species loss in agricultural landscapes. Little is known yet about their efects on insects that not only feed on pollen and nectar but also hunt for arthropod prey for larval nutrition. Here, we provide new evidence that wildfower strips may beneft the provisioning of larval prey for spider-hunting wasps. Woody semi-natural habitats in central Germany were selected as trap-nest locations along independent gradients in distance to wildfower strips and percentage of grassland in the surrounding landscape. From these nests, spider individuals hunted by wasps of the genus *Trypoxylon* (Crabronidae) were collected. In addition, spiders were collected in the associated wildfower strips and the similarity between spider communities in nests and in fowering strips was calculated. The similarity of spider communities decreased with the distance to the next wildfower strips, but the percentage of surrounding grasslands modulated this relationship. This concurred with an observed positive efect of grassland on spider species richness in trap nests, especially if wildfower strips were distant from the nests. In contrast, landscape context did not afect spider species richness in wildfower strips. In conclusion, our results suggest that wildfower strips are used by *Trypoxylon* wasps for hunting spiders as prey for larvae, yet only if strips are close to nesting habitats and well connected by high shares of grassland. Our results substantiate the importance of wildfower strips for species richness and trophic interactions in agroecosystems.

**Keywords** Agri-environmental schemes · Biological control · Landscape complexity · Prey-hunting wasps · Trophic interaction

## **Introduction**

Current studies report a dramatic decline of insect diversity during the last decades (Dirzo et al. [2014;](#page-5-0) Fox et al. [2014](#page-5-1); Woodcock et al. [2016;](#page-6-0) Hallmann et al. [2017\)](#page-5-2). Agricultural

**Electronic supplementary material** The online version of this article [\(https://doi.org/10.1007/s10841-019-00190-6\)](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10841-019-00190-6) contains supplementary material, which is available to authorized users.

 $\boxtimes$  Uta Sophie Hoffmann uhofmann@ecology.uni-kiel.de

<sup>1</sup> Department of Landscape Ecology, Kiel University, Olshausenstraße 75, 24118 Kiel, Germany

- <sup>2</sup> Department of Animal Ecology, Justus Liebig University, Heinrich-Buff-Ring 26-32, 35392 Giessen, Germany
- <sup>3</sup> Leibniz Institute for Science and Mathematics Education, Kiel University, Olshausenstraße 62, 24118 Kiel, Germany

intensifcation is considered to be a main driver of this loss (Foley et al. [2005;](#page-5-3) Rossetti et al. [2017](#page-6-1)). The establishment of wildfower strips within agri-environmental schemes (AES) aims at counteracting this loss (Haaland et al. [2011](#page-5-4); Whittingham [2011\)](#page-6-2). While benefits of wildflower strips to nectar- and pollen collecting insects such as wild bees or butterflies have frequently been shown (Scheper et al. [2015](#page-6-3); Grass et al. [2016](#page-5-5); Ouvrard et al. [2018](#page-6-4)), their effects on other arthropods have only recently received attention in agro-ecological research (e.g. Tschumi et al. [2015](#page-6-5); Baulechner et al. [2019\)](#page-5-6). For solitary wasps, benefts of wildfower strips likely depend on the collected prey (Hoffmann et al. [2018\)](#page-5-7). Here, we focused on spider-hunting wasps and how wildfower strips afect their prey availability in a landscape context.

Similarly to wild bees, adult wasps depend on flowering plants as a nectar source. For larval nutrition, though, female mud-dauber wasps of the genus *Trypoxylon* Latreille (Hymenoptera: Crabronidae) collect spiders,

of which several individuals are provisioned in one brood cell (Witt [1998](#page-6-6)). Related to these food requirements and their abundance in agricultural landscapes (Schüepp et al. [2011;](#page-6-7) Ebeling et al. [2012](#page-5-8)), *Trypoxylon* spp. wasps may be important for the provisioning of ecosystem services such as pollination and of disservices like regulation of biological control by spiders in agroecosystems (c.f. Kleijn et al. [2015](#page-6-8)).

Based on the reported positive effect of plant diversity on richness and abundance of spider-hunting wasps (Fabian et al. [2014](#page-5-9)), flower-rich habitats, such as wildflower strips, might represent attractive foraging sites not only in terms of adult nutrition on nectar, but also nest provisioning in the form of spider prey. Spider species richness and abundance were shown to increase with plant diversity and vegetation coverage, both on the local (Diehl et al. [2013\)](#page-5-10) and landscape scale (Schmidt-Entling and Döbeli [2009](#page-6-9)). Structurally diverse non-crop habitats promote web-building farmland spiders (Bell et al. [2001\)](#page-5-11) and attract especially large spider species (Mader et al. [2017](#page-6-10)). Moreover, Pekár ([2000\)](#page-6-11) frequently found webs of *Phylloneta impressa* Koch (Araneae: Theridiidae) on blue tansy *Phacelia tanacetifolia* BENTHAM (Boraginaceae), a plant species with high coverages in sown wildflower strips.

As cavity-nesting species, however, *Trypoxylon* spp. additionally depend on nearby woody habitats for nesting. Moreover, the quality of the intervening matrix is often crucial for such multi-habitat users, modulating the movement of individuals between landscape elements (Jauker et al. [2009](#page-6-12)). Accordingly, *Trypoxylon* wasps are most common in open landscapes (Coudrain et al. [2013\)](#page-5-12) with a large amount of grassland (Hoffmann et al. [2018](#page-5-7)). Under these conditions, wildflower strips may compensate for poor matrix quality, but only when they are well connected at the landscape level (Hoffmann et al. [2018](#page-5-7)). Whether benefits of wildflower strips are attributed to flower availability for adults or prey availability for provisioning larvae, however, remains unresolved so far.

Here, we studied whether wildflower strips are suited for promoting *Trypoxylon* wasps by providing high spider prey availability. We compared spiders collected into trap nests by *Trypoxylon* spp. individuals and spider communities in associated wildflower strips along a gradient of landscape complexity. We hypothesized that (i) the number of brood cells of *Trypoxylon* spp. is higher in complex landscapes, (ii) the spider species richness in *Trypoxylon* spp. nests increases in more complex compared to simple landscapes, and (iii) the similarity of spider species between *Trypoxylon* spp. nests and associated wildflower strips decreases with increasing distance between these two habitats and decreases with landscape complexity.

#### **Materials and methods**

#### **Study area**

The study was conducted in the district of Marburg-Biedenkopf (Hesse, Germany), a region with 44% of the area under agricultural management. In this area, wildflower strips were sown as part of an AES in 2011 (Hessian Integrated Agri-environmental Program HIAP). According to the scheme, no tillage and no application of fertilizers or pesticides was allowed for 5 years. For our study, we selected the hedgerows nearest to 11 wildflower strips as trap-nest locations, covering a gradient in distance between hedgerows and wildfower strips of 53 - 386 m (mean  $235 \pm 131$  m standard deviation). Wildflower strips were similar in size  $(0.3 \pm 0.04 \text{ ha})$ . Additionally, selected sites represented an independent gradient in area percentage of surrounding grassland (pastures and permanent grasslands; 15–29%) and semi-natural habitats (hedges, gardens, fallows, alluvial meadows, clear cuttings, tree rows, quarries, orchards, and the respective wildflower strip;  $4-17\%$ ) in a sector of 500 m radius. This radius was chosen based on the maximal foraging range of similar sized solitary hymenoptera (Gathmann and Tscharntke [2002;](#page-5-13) Coudrain et al. [2013](#page-5-12)). Percentage area of arable land  $(23-65%)$  and forest edges  $(0-4%)$  in the sectors around selected sites were quantifed. Forest edges are considered potential nesting habitats (cf. Coudrain et al. [2013\)](#page-5-12), as opposed to the forest interior, and their area was calculated by multiplying the length of forest boundaries in each sector by 10 m (Jauker et al. [2012](#page-6-13)). Landscape analyses were carried out using ArcGIS 10 (ESRI, Ca., USA).

#### **Sampling of solitary wasps and their prey**

In May 2013, two trap nests were installed in each of the 11 selected study sites with an inter-trap distance of 10 m. Trap nests consisted of a plastic tube of 27 cm length and 10 cm diameter, flled with approximately 130 internodes of common reed (*Phragmites australis* Cav.) with randomized diameters between 4 mm and 12 mm (Gathmann et al. [1994\)](#page-5-14). Internodes sealed with clay, indicating a completed wasp nest, where carefully removed from the trap nest and replaced by empty ones of similar diameters once a week until the frst week in August. Nests of other wasp genera and wild bees where quantifed in the same way and used for a diferent survey.

Removed nests were cautiously cut open and the number of brood cells built by wasps were counted. From approximately half of the brood cells with collected prey, spiders were removed, counted and classifed to species level. Then nest internodes were closed again with adhesive tape. From September 2013 on, remaining cells were stored in a climate chamber  $(4^{\circ}C)$  to simulate winter until hatching in following spring. After hatching, two individuals per nest were collected, pinned and classifed to species level. All other hatching individuals were released back into nature on the grounds of the university. Analyses were confned to the wasp genus *Trypoxylon*, which accounted for 91% of all spider-hunting individuals in our sample. Within this genus, 88% of the individuals belonged to the species *T. fgulus* Linnaeus, among less abundant species were *T. attenuatum* Smith and *T. clavicerum* Lepeletier & Serville.

#### **Spider collection on wildfower strips**

Previous studies on prey choice of spider-hunting wasps revealed a preference for web-building over ground-dwelling spider species (Polidori et al. [2005](#page-6-14); Polidori and Andrietti [2007\)](#page-6-15). Therefore, we randomly hand-sampled approximately 30 web-building spider individuals in each of the 11 wildfower strips under dry weather conditions in late June/early July 2013 (Mader et al. [2016](#page-6-16)), a method which has been approved in previous studies (Magurran and McGill [2011](#page-6-17); Diehl et al. [2013](#page-5-10)). Collected spiders were frozen for storage and successively classifed to species level.

#### **Statistical analyses**

Data of the two traps per site were pooled by summarizing the number of brood cells for both traps. Since number of brood cells of *Trypoxylon* spp. showed a Poisson error distribution we performed a Generalized Linear Model (GLM) with corresponding error family settings. Linear models (lm) were used to analyze normal-distributed number of prey items per brood cell, species richness of spiders per *Trypoxylon* spp. brood cell and species richness of handcollected spiders on wildfower strips. Independent variables were area percentage of grassland, semi-natural habitats, arable land and forest edges, as well as distance to next wildfower strip. A manual forward selection procedure was used to select fnal models. In this procedure, distance to next wildfower strip entered the model frst and remained in the model until the four land-use variables and their interaction with distance successively entered the model in a predefned order: semi-natural habitats, arable land, grassland and forest edge. Based on a p-level of 0.05, non-signifcant landscape variables were not retained in the model. Only if land-use variables did not show a signifcant relationship, distance to wildfower strip, as the main factor in this study, was removed from the model and the landscape variables were tested consecutively. For visual presentation of interacting

efects between the continuous explanatory variables in the fgures, we split percentage of grassland into two categories, 'high' and 'low', separated by the median.

Spider community composition of trap nests and wildfower strips were compared using the Jaccard index (*J*):

#### $J = 2BCI/(1 + BCI)$

The underlying Bray–Curtis dissimilarity index was calculated using R function *vegdist* in package *vegan* (Oksanen et al. [2012](#page-6-18)):

$$
BCI_{ij} = \frac{\sum_{k=1}^{n} |x_{ik} - x_{jk}|}{\sum_{k=1}^{n} (x_{ik} + x_{jk})}
$$

where BCI is the dissimilarity between spider species (x) captured by *Trypoxylon* spp. in trap-nests (i) and available on wildfower strips (j) for each study site (k). The values range from zero to one, whereby one indicates most dissimilar and zero identical communities. Since *Trypoxylon* spp. were absent from two study sites, those were excluded from statistical analysis on community similarity.

All statistical analyses were carried out in R 3.2.2 (R Core Team [2014](#page-6-19)).

## **Results**

In total, 1129 brood cells in 258 nests along our study sites where built by cavity nesting bee and wasp species. Individuals of the genus *Trypoxylon* spp. were the most abundant spider-hunting wasps, with 374 brood cells built in 93 nests in nine of the eleven study sites. The number of brood cells of *Trypoxylon* spp. was driven by an interacting efect of the amount of grassland in the surrounding area and the distance between nesting site and the next wildflower strip ( $R_{\text{adj}}^2$  = 0.96, p<0.001; Table [1\)](#page-3-0). In landscapes with high shares of grassland, the number of brood cells increased with increasing distance of trap nests from wildfower strips; in landscapes with low shares of grassland the number of brood cells was low and did not change with the distance of nests to the wildflower strip (Fig. [1](#page-3-1)). Other landscape variables had no efect on the number of brood cells.

A total of 630 spider individuals belonging to ten species were extracted from 198 brood cells. On average, *Trypoxylon* spp. collected  $5.3 \pm 2.0$  spider individuals per cell independent of any landscape variable in our study. The mean species number per cell was 2.8±1.1. *Phylloneta impressa* was the most abundant spider species (82% of all individuals found in trap nests). A signifcant interaction suggests that the number of spider species caught by *Trypoxylon* spp. per site was jointly afected by the distance of nests to the next wildfower strip and the area percentage of grassland in the

Dependent	Explanatory	Direction	d.f.	t value	$\boldsymbol{P}$	(Whole model) Adjusted $\mathbb{R}^2$ ; p
Number of brood cells of <i>Trypoxylon</i> spp.	Distance		1, 11	$-2.315$	0.021	0.96<0.001
	Grassland		1,11	$-0.156$	0.876	
	Distance: grassland	$^{+}$	1, 11	4.335	< 0.001	
Spider species in trap nests	Distance	-	1, 9	$-3.424$	0.019	0.76; 0.017
	Grassland	-	1, 9	$-2.470$	0.057	
	Distance: grassland	$+$	1,9	4.002	0.010	
Jaccard dissimilarity	Distance	$\overline{\phantom{0}}$	1, 9	$-3.127$	0.026	0.70; 0.030
	Grassland	-	1,9	$-4.291$	0.008	
	Distance: grassland	$+$	1, 9	3.483	0.018	
Spider species on wildflower strips					n.s.	
Number of prey items per brood cell					n.s.	

<span id="page-3-0"></span>**Table 1** Model results for all dependent variables

Explanatory variables and the adjusted  $R<sup>2</sup>$  are given for the most parsimonious model. Final models were selected using a stepwise forward selection method

4

3



<span id="page-3-1"></span>**Fig. 1** Number of brood cells of *Trypoxylon* as a function of distance to next wildfower strip, interacting with the area percentage of grassland in the surrounding landscape. Amount of grassland was divided at the median (21%) into the categories low grassland percentage (grey circles) and high grassland percentage (black circles)

surrounding landscape  $(F_{3,5} = 9.29, R_{\text{adj}}^2 = 0.76, p = 0.017;$ Table [1](#page-3-0)). In landscapes with high shares of grassland the number of spider species in brood cells increased with distance between nests and wildfower strips, while in landscapes with low shares of grassland it rather decreased with distance (Fig. [2](#page-3-2)). Other landscape variables had no efect on the number of spider species in brood cells.

A total of 15 spider species where recorded in wildfower strips. The mean richness per site was  $3.9 \pm 1.5$  species and



<span id="page-3-2"></span>**Fig. 2** Spider species richness of prey individuals in nests of the solitary wasp Trypoxylon as a function of distance to next wildfower strip, interacting with the area percentage of grassland in the surrounding landscape. Amount of grassland was divided at the median (21%) into the categories low grassland percentage (grey circles) and high grassland percentage (black circles)

did not correlate with any landscape variable. The most abundant spider was *P. impressa*. It accounted for 73% of all hand-collected spider individuals, without this share being modulated by any explanatory variable. A signifcant interaction indicates that the community dissimilarity (*J*) of spiders found in trap-nests of *Trypoxylon* spp. and spiders handcollected on wildfower strips was mutually afected by the trap nest distance to the wildflower strips and the area percentage of grassland in the surrounding landscape  $(F_{3,5} = 7.08, R_{\text{adj}}^2 = 0.70, p = 0.030;$  Table [1\)](#page-3-0). In landscapes with high shares of grassland, communities of spiders became more dissimilar with increasing distance between traps and wildfower strips while in landscapes with low shares of grassland the dissimilarity did not change along the distance gradient and was equally high as for the most distant traps in landscapes with a lot of grassland (Fig. [3](#page-4-0)). The community dissimilarity was unafected by other landscape variables.

#### **Discussion**

While numerous studies have focused on the effects of wildfower strips on nectar- and pollen-feeding insects, few have considered how these strips afect resource availability for prey-hunting wasps in agricultural landscapes. Our results suggest that also spider-hunting wasps of the genus *Trypoxylon* utilize wildflower strips to collect spider prey for feeding their larvae, yet only when wildfower strips are close to nests and well connected by high shares of grassland. Thus, our results contribute to the evidence that wildfower strips offer resources not only to flower-visiting but also preyhunting hymenoptera.



<span id="page-4-0"></span>**Fig. 3** Jaccard dissimilarity index (*J)* of spider communities as prey within trap nests compared to available spiders on wildflower strips. Plotted as a function of distance to next wildfower strip, interacting with the area percentage of grassland in the surrounding landscape. Amount of grassland was divided at the median (21%) into the categories low grassland percentage (grey circles) and high grassland percentage (black circles)

In landscapes with high shares of grassland, the number of brood cells of *Trypoxylon* spp. increased with increasing distance of nests from wildfower strips whereas in landscapes with low shares of grassland the number of brood cells was low and did not change with the distance of nests to the wildfower strip (Fig. [1\)](#page-3-1). Grassland can provide fowering plants as a nectar source for adult nutrition and spiders as larval food. Concerning solitary wasps, it additionally increases the connectivity between nesting and other foraging sites (Holzschuh et al. [2009;](#page-6-20) Krewenka et al. [2011\)](#page-6-21). This may enable solitary wasps to provide more brood cells with spiders per unit time if grasslands are abundant. Yet, when shares of grasslands are high and sown wildflower strips close, *Trypoxylon* spp. may choose to search for its presumed preferred prey species in wildfower strips. As the vertical structure is usually more complex in wildflower strips than in grasslands, though, fewer spiders might be caught per unit time in wildfower strips than in grassland, leading to fewer cells built.

Spider-hunting digger wasps have been shown to prefer web-building over ground-dwelling spiders as their prey (Polidori et al. [2005;](#page-6-14) Polidori and Andrietti [2007\)](#page-6-15). This is consistent with our fnding that the prey of *Trypoxylon* spp. was dominated by the most abundant web-building spider species, *P. impressa* (cf. Coudrain et al. [2013;](#page-5-12) Hofmann et al. [2018](#page-5-7)). *Phylloneta impressa* builds three dimensional tangle webs within the vegetation (Pekár [2000;](#page-6-11) Jurczyk et al. [2012](#page-6-22)) and dominates the spider communities of both fowering felds and cereal felds in our study region (Mader et al. [2016](#page-6-16)). Based on the consistent interaction of the distance between nests and sown fowering strips and the landscape share of grassland and the absence of any efect of the amount of arable land, we suppose fowering strips to be preferred over arable felds in foraging for *P. impressa*.

The richness of spider species hunted by *Trypoxylon* spp. increased with the distance of nests to the next wildfower strip, but only in grassland dominated landscapes. Considering the known dominance of *P. impressa* in nests of *Trypoxylon* (cf. Coudrain et al. [2013](#page-5-12); Hoffmann et al. [2018](#page-5-7)) and the fact that *P. impressa* was equally dominant across wildflower strips (Mader et al. [2016](#page-6-16)), the observed pattern suggests a shift towards less preferred prey with increasing distances of nests from foraging habitats providing this preferred prey when alternative hunting grounds are more readily available or fowering strips are less well connected. With preypredator-size relations being higher in spider-hunting than in other groups of predatory wasps (De Beaumont [1964](#page-5-15); Fabian et al. [2014](#page-5-9)), a trade-off between prey quality and carrying distance may explain this shift. Whether ftness costs are related to such a prey shift remains unclear to date. Previous studies on the genus *Polistes* show that predatory wasps are able to distinguish between prey of diferent quality (Stamp [2001](#page-6-23); Armstrong and Stamp [2003](#page-5-16)). A diet of unpalatable prey resulted in smaller nests or colonies built and in smaller wasps and reduced the proportion of males produced (Stamp [2001\)](#page-6-23). So far it remains unknown, however, how prey choice afects the reproduction of *Trypoxylon* spp. and whether lower numbers of brood cells will be compensated by higher emergence ratios or better body condition of individuals from cells provisioned with *P. impressa*.

Spiders predominantly capture insects, including both pest (e.g. herbivores) and benefcial species (e.g. pollinators) (Birkhofer and Wolters [2012](#page-5-17); Birkhofer et al. [2013](#page-5-18)). As spider-hunters, *Trypoxylon* spp. thus significantly increase the diversity of trophic interactions and likely contribute to ecosystem stability (c.f. Sanders et al. [2018\)](#page-6-24). Our results suggest that wildfower strips are suitable foraging habitats for spider-hunting wasps. This highlights the potential of sown wildflower strips to increase biodiversity beyond classical pollinators (c.f. Baulechner et al. [2019](#page-5-6)). For this to become fully effective, however, considerable attention has to be paid to the landscape context, in particular the connectedness between these new foraging habitats and existing nesting sites.

**Acknowledgements** Establishment and maintenance of the study sites was funded by the federal state of Hesse (Germany) as part of the regional Hessian Integrated Agri-environmental Program (HIAP). Thanks to Michael Zerbe and Karina Weiß of Amt für Ländlichen Raum Marburg-Biedenkopf for their cooperation and the farmers who supported our study. We are grateful to Daniela Warzecha for selecting the study sites, funded by the German Federal Environmental Foundation (DBU). Thanks to Daniela Warzecha and Anna Hörner for spider collection and to Elvira Sereda and Sergei Sereda for determination of spider species. Thanks to two anonymous reviewers for helpful comments that improved the manuscript.

#### **Compliance with ethical standards**

**Conflict of interest** The authors declare that they have no confict of interest.

**Ethical approval** The authors also complied with journal's ethical standards regarding the integrity of the research and its presentation. The presented research involved the collection of cavity-nesting wasps and their spider prey. The work conforms to the legal requirements of Germany including those relating to conservation, and to the journal's policy on these matters. Every effort was made to reduce the impact of our research on local populations. This included the release of all but one reference individual per nest back to nature.

### **References**

- <span id="page-5-16"></span>Armstrong TR, Stamp NE (2003) Effects of prey quantity on predatory wasps (Polistes dominulus) when patch quality differs. Behav Ecol Sociobiol 54:310–319. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s0026](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00265-003-0624-1) [5-003-0624-1](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00265-003-0624-1)
- <span id="page-5-6"></span>Baulechner D, Diekötter T, Wolters V, Jauker F (2019) Converting arable land into fowering felds changes functional and phylogenetic

community structure in ground beetles. Biol Conserv 231:51–58. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2019.01.005>

- <span id="page-5-11"></span>Bell JR, Wheater CP, Cullen WR (2001) The implications of grassland and heathland management for the conservation of spider communities: a review. J Zool 255:S0952836901001479. [https](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0952836901001479) [://doi.org/10.1017/S0952836901001479](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0952836901001479)
- <span id="page-5-17"></span>Birkhofer K, Wolters V (2012) The global relationship between climate, net primary production and the diet of spiders. Glob Ecol Biogeogr 21:100–108. [https://doi.org/10.111](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1466-8238.2011.00654.x) [1/j.1466-8238.2011.00654.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1466-8238.2011.00654.x)
- <span id="page-5-18"></span>Birkhofer K, Entling MH, Lubin Y (2013) Agroecology. Trait composition, spatial relationships, trophic interactions. In: Penney D (ed) Spider research in the 21st century. Trands & perspective. Siri Scientifc Press, Manchaster, pp 200–229
- <span id="page-5-12"></span>Coudrain V, Herzog F, Entling MH (2013) Efects of habitat fragmentation on abundance, larval food and parasitism of a spiderhunting wasp. PLoS ONE 8:e59286. [https://doi.org/10.1371/](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0059286) [journal.pone.0059286](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0059286)
- <span id="page-5-15"></span>De Beaumont J (1964) Hymenoptera: Sphecidae. Insecta Helvetica, Fauna 3. Sociéte Entomologique Suisse, Lausanne
- <span id="page-5-10"></span>Diehl E, Mader VL, Wolters V, Birkhofer K (2013) Management intensity and vegetation complexity afect web-building spiders and their prey. Oecologia 173:579–589. [https://doi.org/10.1007/](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00442-013-2634-7) [s00442-013-2634-7](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00442-013-2634-7)
- <span id="page-5-0"></span>Dirzo R, Young HS, Galetti M et al (2014) Defaunation in the Anthropocene. Science 345:401–406. [https://doi.org/10.1126/](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1251817) [science.1251817](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1251817)
- <span id="page-5-8"></span>Ebeling A, Klein AM, Weisser WW, Tscharntke T (2012) Multitrophic efects of experimental changes in plant diversity on cavity-nesting bees, wasps, and their parasitoids. Oecologia 169:453–465.<https://doi.org/10.1007/s00442-011-2205-8>
- <span id="page-5-9"></span>Fabian Y, Sandau N, Bruggisser OT et al (2014) Plant diversity in a nutshell: testing for small-scale efects on trap nesting wild bees and wasps. Ecosphere 5:1–18. [https://doi.org/10.1890/](https://doi.org/10.1890/ES13-00375.1) [ES13-00375.1](https://doi.org/10.1890/ES13-00375.1)
- <span id="page-5-3"></span>Foley JA, DeFries R, Asner GP et al (2005) Global consequences of land use. Science 309:570–574. [https://doi.org/10.1126/scien](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1111772) [ce.1111772](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1111772)
- <span id="page-5-1"></span>Fox R, Oliver TH, Harrower C et al (2014) Long-term changes to the frequency of occurrence of British moths are consistent with opposing and synergistic effects of climate and land-use changes. J Appl Ecol 51:949–957. [https://doi.](https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2664.12256) [org/10.1111/1365-2664.12256](https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2664.12256)
- <span id="page-5-13"></span>Gathmann A, Tscharntke T (2002) Foraging ranges of solitary bees. J Anim Ecol 71:757–764. [https://doi.org/10.104](https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2656.2002.00641.x) [6/j.1365-2656.2002.00641.x](https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2656.2002.00641.x)
- <span id="page-5-14"></span>Gathmann A, Greiler H-J, Tscharntke T (1994) Trap-nesting bees and wasps colonizing set-aside felds: succession and body size, management by cutting and sowing. Oecologia 98:8–14. [https://doi.](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00326084) [org/10.1007/BF00326084](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00326084)
- <span id="page-5-5"></span>Grass I, Albrecht J, Jauker F et al (2016) Much more than bees—Wildfower plantings support highly diverse fower-visitor communities from complex to structurally simple agricultural landscapes. Agric Ecosyst Environ 225:45–53. [https://doi.org/10.1016/j.](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2016.04.001) [agee.2016.04.001](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2016.04.001)
- <span id="page-5-4"></span>Haaland C, Naisbit RE, Bersier L-F (2011) Sown wildflower strips for insect conservation: a review. Insect Conserv Divers 4:60–80. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1752-4598.2010.00098.x>
- <span id="page-5-2"></span>Hallmann CA, Sorg M, Jongejans E, Siepel H, Hofland N, Schwan H, Stenmans W, Muller A, Sumser H, Horren T, Goulson D, de Kroon H (2017) More than 75 percent decline over 27 years in total fying insect biomass in protected areas. PLoS ONE 12(10):21.<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0185809>
- <span id="page-5-7"></span>Hofmann US, Jauker F, Lanzen J et al (2018) Prey-dependent benefts of sown wildfower strips on solitary wasps in agroecosystems.
- <span id="page-6-20"></span>Holzschuh A, Steffan-dewenter I, Tscharntke T (2009) Grass strip corridors in agricultural landscapes enhance nest-site colonization by solitary wasps. Ecol Appl 19:123–132
- <span id="page-6-12"></span>Jauker F, Diekötter T, Schwarzbach F, Wolters V (2009) Pollinator dispersal in an agricultural matrix: opposing responses of wild bees and hoverfies to landscape structure and distance from main habitat. Landsc Ecol 24:547–555. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s1098](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10980-009-9331-2) [0-009-9331-2](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10980-009-9331-2)
- <span id="page-6-13"></span>Jauker F, Peter F, Wolters V, Diekötter T (2012) Early reproductive benefts of mass-fowering crops to the solitary bee Osmia rufa outbalance post-fowering disadvantages. Basic Appl Ecol 13:268–276.<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.baae.2012.03.010>
- <span id="page-6-22"></span>Jurczyk M, Wolters V, Birkhofer K (2012) Utilization of prey-rich patches leads to reproductive advantages for clustered individuals of a web-building spider. Écoscience 19:170–176. [https://doi.](https://doi.org/10.2980/19-2-3517) [org/10.2980/19-2-3517](https://doi.org/10.2980/19-2-3517)
- <span id="page-6-8"></span>Kleijn D, Winfree R, Bartomeus I et al (2015) Delivery of crop pollination services is an insufficient argument for wild pollinator conservation. Nat Commun 6:7414. [https://doi.org/10.1038/](https://doi.org/10.1038/ncomms8414) [ncomms8414](https://doi.org/10.1038/ncomms8414)
- <span id="page-6-21"></span>Krewenka KM, Holzschuh A, Tscharntke T, Dormann CF (2011) Landscape elements as potential barriers and corridors for bees, wasps and parasitoids. Biol Conserv 144:1816–1825. [https://doi.](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2011.03.014) [org/10.1016/j.biocon.2011.03.014](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2011.03.014)
- <span id="page-6-16"></span>Mader V, Birkhofer K, Fiedler D et al (2016) Land use at diferent spatial scales alters the functional role of web-building spiders in arthropod food webs. Agric Ecosyst Environ 219:152–162. [https](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2015.12.017) [://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2015.12.017](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2015.12.017)
- <span id="page-6-10"></span>Mader V, Diehl E, Fiedler D et al (2017) Trade-ofs in arthropod conservation between productive and non-productive agri-environmental schemes along a landscape complexity gradient. Insect Conserv Divers 10:236–247. <https://doi.org/10.1111/icad.12220>
- <span id="page-6-17"></span>Magurran AE, McGill B (2011) Biological diversity—frontiers in measurement and assessment. Oxford University Press, New York
- <span id="page-6-18"></span>Oksanen J, Blanchet FG, Friendly M, et al (2012) vegan: Community Ecology Package. 2.4-6
- <span id="page-6-4"></span>Ouvrard P, Transon J, Jacquemart A-L (2018) Flower-strip agri-environment schemes provide diverse and valuable summer fower resources for pollinating insects. Biodivers Conserv 27:2193– 2216.<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10531-018-1531-0>
- <span id="page-6-11"></span>Pekár S (2000) Webs, diet, and fecundity of Theridion impressum (Araneae: Theridiidae). Eur J Entomol 97:47–50. [https://doi.](https://doi.org/10.14411/eje.2000.012) [org/10.14411/eje.2000.012](https://doi.org/10.14411/eje.2000.012)
- <span id="page-6-15"></span>Polidori C, Andrietti F (2007) Factors affecting spider prey selection by Sceliphron mud- dauber wasps (Hymenoptera : Sphecidae) in northern Italy. Anim Biol 57:11–28. [https://doi.org/10.1163/15707](https://doi.org/10.1163/157075607780002005) [5607780002005](https://doi.org/10.1163/157075607780002005)
- <span id="page-6-14"></span>Polidori C, Boesi R, Isola F, Andrietti F (2005) Provisioning patterns and choice of prey in the digger wasp Cerceris arenaria (Hymenoptera: Crabronidae): the role of prey size. Eur J Entomol 102:801–804. <https://doi.org/10.14411/eje.2005.111>
- <span id="page-6-19"></span>R Core Team (2014) R: a language and environment for statistical computing. R foundation for statistical computing, Vienna, Austria. <http://www.R-project.org/>
- <span id="page-6-1"></span>Rossetti MR, Tscharntke T, Aguilar R, Batáry P (2017) Responses of insect herbivores and herbivory to habitat fragmentation: a hierarchical meta-analysis. Ecol Lett 20:264-272. [https://doi.](https://doi.org/10.1111/ele.12723) [org/10.1111/ele.12723](https://doi.org/10.1111/ele.12723)
- <span id="page-6-24"></span>Sanders D, Thébault E, Kehoe R, Frank van Veen FJ (2018) Trophic redundancy reduces vulnerability to extinction cascades. Proc Natl Acad Sci 115:2419–2424. [https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.17168](https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1716825115) [25115](https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1716825115)
- <span id="page-6-3"></span>Scheper J, Bommarco R, Holzschuh A et al (2015) Local and landscape-level foral resources explain efects of wildfower strips on wild bees across four European countries. J Appl Ecol 52:1165– 1175. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2664.12479>
- <span id="page-6-9"></span>Schmidt-Entling MH, Döbeli J (2009) Sown wildflower areas to enhance spiders in arable felds. Agric Ecosyst Environ 133:19– 22.<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2009.04.015>
- <span id="page-6-7"></span>Schüepp C, Herrmann JD, Herzog F, Schmidt-Entling MH (2011) Differential efects of habitat isolation and landscape composition on wasps, bees, and their enemies. Oecologia 165:713–721. [https://](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00442-010-1746-6) [doi.org/10.1007/s00442-010-1746-6](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00442-010-1746-6)
- <span id="page-6-23"></span>Stamp NE (2001) Effects of prey quantity and quality on predatory wasps. Ecol Entomol 26:292–301. [https://doi.org/10.104](https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2311.2001.00325.x) [6/j.1365-2311.2001.00325.x](https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2311.2001.00325.x)
- <span id="page-6-5"></span>Tschumi M, Albrecht M, Entling MH, Jacot K (2015) High efectiveness of tailored fower strips in reducing pests and crop plant damage. Proc R Soc B 282:20151369. [https://doi.org/10.1098/](https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2015.1369) [rspb.2015.1369](https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2015.1369)
- <span id="page-6-2"></span>Whittingham MJ (2011) The future of agri-environment schemes: biodiversity gains and ecosystem service delivery? J Appl Ecol 48:509–513.<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2664.2011.01987.x>
- <span id="page-6-6"></span>Witt R (1998) Wespen beobachten, bestimmen. Naturbuch Verlag, Augsburg
- <span id="page-6-0"></span>Woodcock BA, Isaac NJB, Bullock JM et al (2016) Impacts of neonicotinoid use on long-term population changes in wild bees in England. Nat Commun 7:12459. [https://doi.org/10.1038/ncomm](https://doi.org/10.1038/ncomms12459) [s12459](https://doi.org/10.1038/ncomms12459)

**Publisher's Note** Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.