

1 **Combined stress from parasites, pesticides and lack of flowers drives bee declines**

2

3

4 **Dave Goulson, Elizabeth Nicholls, Cristina Botías and Ellen L. Rotheray**

5

6

7 School of Life Sciences, University of Sussex, Falmer, Brighton, BN1 9QG

8 Email: D.Goulson@sussex.ac.uk

9

10

11 **Abstract**

12 Bees are subject to numerous pressures in the modern world. The abundance and diversity of
13 flowers has declined, bees are chronically exposed to cocktails of agrochemicals, and they are
14 simultaneously exposed to novel parasites accidentally spread by humans. Climate change is
15 likely to exacerbate these problems in the future. Stressors do not act in isolation; for example
16 pesticide exposure can impair both detoxification mechanisms and immune responses,
17 rendering bees more susceptible to parasites. It seems certain that chronic exposure to
18 multiple, interacting stressors is driving honey bee colony losses and declines of wild
19 pollinators, but such interactions are not addressed by current regulatory procedures and
20 studying these interactions experimentally poses a major challenge. In the meantime, taking
21 steps to reduce stress on bees would seem prudent; incorporating flower-rich habitat into
22 farmland, reducing pesticide use through adopting more sustainable farming methods, and
23 enforcing effective quarantine measures on bee movements are all practical measures that
24 should be adopted. Effective monitoring of wild pollinator populations is urgently needed to
25 inform management strategies into the future.

26

27 **Is there a ‘pollination crisis’?**

28 Insect pollination is vitally important to terrestrial ecosystems and to crop production. The
29 oft-quoted statistics are that 75% of our crop species benefit from insect pollinators (1),
30 which provide a global service worth \$215 billion to food production (2). Hence the potential
31 that we may be facing a “pollination crisis” (3, 4) in which crop yields begin to fall because
32 of inadequate pollination has generated understandable debate and concern and stimulated
33 much research in recent decades. Nonetheless, knowledge gaps remain substantial, both with
34 regard to the extent and causes of pollinator declines. Indeed, for most regions of the globe
35 and for most wild pollinator taxa, we have no data as to whether there have actually been
36 declines. Our best estimates are for numbers of domesticated honey bee colonies, which can
37 be obtained for many countries with varying reliability. Overall, these suggest that numbers
38 of managed honey bee colonies have decreased in Europe (25% loss of colonies in central
39 Europe between 1985 and 2005 (5)), and markedly in North America (59% loss of colonies
40 between 1947 and 2005 (6, 7)). However, overall global stocks actually increased by ~45%
41 between 1961 and 2008, due to a major increase in numbers of hives in countries such as
42 China and Argentina (8). Conversely, there are widespread reports of unusually high rates of
43 honey bee colony loss from many parts of the world, sometimes ascribed to a syndrome

44 known as Colony Collapse Disorder (CCD) (9). It seems that socioeconomic factors (such as
45 increasing demand for pollination or honey (10), are at present sufficient to incentivise
46 beekeepers to overcome problems with bee health, when examined at a global scale (but not
47 locally in North America and Europe).

48 If we turn to wild pollinators, the best data available are for bumblebees (11). In
49 Europe, many species have undergone substantial range contractions and localized extinction,
50 with four species going extinct throughout the continent (11, 12) (Figure 1a). In North
51 America, some formerly abundant and widespread species such as *Bombus terricola* and *B.*
52 *occidentalis* underwent severe declines from the late 1990s onwards, and now occupy only a
53 small fraction of their former range (Figure 1b) (13, 14). *Bombus franklini*, a species formerly
54 found in northern California and Oregon, has not been recorded since 2006 and is presumed
55 extinct. In a study of the bumblebee fauna of Illinois over the past 100 years, Grixti *et al.* (15)
56 describe substantial declines in species diversity, particularly in the period 1940-1960, with
57 the extirpation of four species during the 20th century. In South America, the recent invasion
58 by the European species *B. terrestris* is causing precipitous declines in the native *B.*
59 *dahlbomii* (16). There is some evidence of loss of species richness from lowland areas of
60 Sichuan in China (17, 18), and a few reports of declines in Japan from the mid 1990s
61 onwards (19, 20), but elsewhere in the world, few data are available. For the remaining wild
62 bees, data are exceedingly sparse, though they comprise the large majority of the world's
63 approximately 22,000 bee species. Analysis of historic records suggests that diversity of both
64 bumblebees and other wild bees declined in the UK, Netherlands and Belgium during the
65 twentieth century, but that these declines have decelerated since 1990 (21, 22). In surveys in
66 Illinois, 50% of wild bee species went extinct over a 120 year period to 2010 (23). Given that
67 bee diversity has declined in both Europe and the Americas, it is probably reasonable to
68 assume that declines are also occurring elsewhere across the globe

69 The biggest knowledge gap is regarding bee abundance; although we have maps of
70 past and present distributions of bees for some well-studied countries such as the UK, we
71 have almost no data on how populations have changed over time. Hence we do not know
72 whether common species such as *Bombus terrestris* in Europe or *Bombus impatiens* in North
73 America are less abundant than formerly, or whether they are currently in decline. Most
74 pollination is delivered by a small number of these abundant species which tend to have large
75 distributions. Declines in their abundance would not be detected in distribution maps until

76 they become extinct in parts of their range, which is rather late to introduce conservation
77 measures.

78 Another way to examine the likelihood or proximity of a pollination crisis is to
79 examine delivery of pollination services. Although global honey bee stocks have increased by
80 ~45%, demand has risen more than supply, for the fraction of global crops that require animal
81 pollination has tripled over the same time period (8), making food production more
82 dependent on pollinators than before. It has also emerged that the majority of crop
83 pollination, at a global scale, is delivered by wild pollinators rather than honey bees. Yields
84 correlate better with wild pollinators abundance than with abundance of honey bees (24–26);
85 hence increasing honey bee numbers alone is unlikely to provide a complete solution to the
86 increasing demand for pollination. Reliance on a single species is also a risky strategy (27).
87 Whilst Aizen *et al.* (28) concluded from a global analysis of changing crop yields over time
88 that there was not yet any clear evidence that a shortage of pollinators was reducing yield, a
89 subsequent analysis of the same data set by Garibaldi *et al.* (29) shows that yields of
90 pollinator-dependent crops are more variable, and have increased less, than crops that do not
91 benefit from pollinators, to the extent that a shortage of pollinators is reducing the stability of
92 agricultural food production. In a meta-analysis of 29 studies on diverse crops and contrasting
93 biomes, Garibaldi *et al.* (30) found that wild pollinator visitation and yields generally drop
94 with increasing distance from natural areas, suggesting that yields on some farms are already
95 impacted by inadequate pollination.

96 To summarize, in the past 50 years global honey bee stocks have increased, while
97 wild bees appear to have declined substantially, as evidenced by data for bumblebees, and
98 very scant data for other bee species. The demand for insect pollinators in farming has tripled
99 in the same period. There is clearly no major pollination crisis yet, but there is evidence for
100 localized limitation of crop yield as a result of inadequate pollination.

101

102 **Drivers of wild bee declines and honey bee colony losses**

103

104 Habitat loss

105 Bee declines have been attributed to many factors, some more plausible than others; however,
106 the clear consensus is that loss of habitat has been a long-term contributor to declines (11,
107 31–33). Bees require appropriate floral resources during the adult flight season, which may
108 be short for some solitary species or year-long for social species in tropical environments.

109 They also require undisturbed nest sites, with different species occupying diverse locations
110 (e.g. cavities underground, hollow-stemmed twigs, burrows in the soil, even abandoned snail
111 shells). The conversion of natural and semi-natural flower-rich habitat to farmland has been a
112 major driver of long-term declines in bees. For example, in the UK, approximately 97% of
113 flower-rich grasslands were lost in the 20th century (34), and this has resulted in major range
114 contractions of bee species associated with this habitat, particularly long-tongued bumblebees
115 (11). Declines of similar magnitude have affected the grasslands of North America, although
116 these began in the early 19th century (35).

117 Urbanization also contributes to loss of natural habitat, but the net effect on bees is
118 less clear. Gardens can support high densities of wild bees, particularly bumblebees and some
119 solitary bee species, but highly urbanized environments have few bees (36, 37), and the
120 building of roads and other infrastructure undoubtedly contributes to the ongoing
121 fragmentation and degradation of habitats. Increased traffic can also cause direct mortality
122 through collisions (38), although the numbers of bees killed in this way is not known. The
123 planting of road verges and traffic islands with wildflowers is often promoted as a means of
124 boosting urban pollinator populations, but it might increase mortality by vehicle collisions.

125

126 Parasites and disease

127 Bees naturally suffer from a broad range of parasites, parasitoids and pathogens, the latter
128 including protozoans, fungi, bacteria and viruses. By far the majority of research has focused
129 on those associated with honey bees and to a lesser extent with bumblebees, with very little
130 known about the pathogens of other wild bee species. Some bee diseases, such as Deformed
131 Wing Virus (DWV) and *Nosema ceranae*, have broad host ranges and are able to infect both
132 honey bees and bumblebees while others, such as *Crithidia bombi* or *Paenibacillus larvae*,
133 seem to be more host-specific (39–41). While natural pathogens undoubtedly play an
134 important but poorly-understood role in influencing the population dynamics of their bee
135 hosts, we will focus here on the impacts that non-native parasites and pathogens may have.

136 The spread of most honey bee parasites and pathogens has occurred inadvertently as
137 a result of transporting honey bees long distances. Much of this happened in historic times,
138 but it continues, despite some improvements in quarantine procedures. The best-known
139 example is the mite *Varroa destructor*, originally associated with the Asian honey bee *Apis*
140 *cerana*. *Varroa* has since jumped hosts to the European honey bee *Apis mellifera*, which has
141 little resistance to this pest. Since the 1960s *Varroa* has spread from Asia to Europe, the

142 Americas and most recently to New Zealand. The mite acts as a vector for pathogens such as
143 DWV, and the combined effect of the mite and the diseases it transmits is a major contributor
144 to honey bee colony losses in North America and Europe (42, 43). Fortunately, the mite
145 appears unable to survive on bees outside the genus *Apis*.

146 A strikingly similar series of events has also seen the microsporidian *N. ceranae* jump
147 from *A. cerana* to *A. mellifera*, and in the past 20 years it has spread to Europe and the
148 Americas, where it is now prevalent at high frequency (Figure 2) (44, 45). It has also been
149 detected in wild bumblebees in Europe, China and South America (41, 46, 47), and solitary
150 bees in Europe (48). In the lab *N. ceranae* appears to have higher virulence in bumblebees
151 than it does in honey bees (41), though the impact it has had on wild populations is unknown.
152 Asia is not the only source of non-native diseases; the African honey bee parasite *Aethina*
153 *tumida* (small hive beetle) recently invaded North America, Egypt, Australia and Europe, and
154 attacks *B. impatiens* colonies causing considerable damage (49, 50). It seems highly likely
155 that it also attacks other wild bumblebee species that are not so readily cultured and therefore
156 less well studied.

157 Bee diseases are also being redistributed around the globe by the commercial trade in
158 bumblebee colonies, which are mainly used for pollination of greenhouse crops such as
159 tomatoes. This trade began in the 1980s in Europe, and now more than 1 million nests of the
160 European *Bombus terrestris* are reared each year and exported to various countries. In North
161 America, the eastern American species *Bombus impatiens* is reared for this purpose.
162 Unfortunately, it does not seem possible yet to rear colonies that are free of disease, not least
163 because the bees are reared on honey-bee collected pollen, providing a route for exposure to
164 many bee pathogens. Commercial colonies of *B. terrestris* are commonly infected with one or
165 more parasites, including *Nosema bombi*, *N. ceranae*, *Apicystis bombi* and DWV (41).

166 There is evidence that non-native pathogens or pathogen strains associated with these
167 colonies are having devastating impacts on wild bumblebee populations. In North America,
168 the accidental importation of a non-native strain of the parasite *Nosema bombi* via
169 commercial bumblebees has been implicated in the dramatic decline of several bumblebee
170 species, though convincing causal evidence remains elusive (51, 52). The evidence from
171 South America is clearer; here, *B. terrestris* were deliberately introduced by the Chilean
172 government despite the presence of native *Bombus* species, with *terrestris* spreading rapidly
173 to occupy a vast area of southern South America. The arrival of *B. terrestris* appears to have
174 led to the rapid local extinction of the native *B. dahlbomii* at a speed only plausibly explained

175 by pathogen spillover (16). Although the parasite responsible has yet to be ascertained with
176 certainty, both *A. bombi* and *C. bombi* have been shown to be highly prevalent in the invasive
177 species (16, 53). There is a clear parallel with the devastating impact that the arrival of
178 European diseases had on the native Americans 500 years ago.

179 Even when commercial bees are free of disease on arrival, or are infected only with
180 indigenous parasites, they can still affect native pollinators. High-density populations of
181 managed bees may provide conditions for the rapid multiplication of parasites that then spill
182 over into wild populations (54–56). A combination of field observations and modelling
183 suggest that waves of *Crithidia bombi* infection travel outwards from greenhouses containing
184 commercial bumblebees. Prediction indicates that waves can spread at ~2 km per week, with
185 up to 100% of wild bees within the spreading radius becoming infected, although this is not
186 yet well supported by direct evidence (55).

187 In general we know little about the natural geographic range, host range, prevalence
188 or virulence of most bee pathogens, and so it would seem wise to take very careful
189 precautions to prevent further introductions of bee pathogens from outside their native range,
190 in addition to minimizing any spillover from commercial pollination operations (52, 57).

191

192 Pesticides

193 The most controversial and debated cause of bee declines are pesticides. When appropriately
194 used, pesticides can provide an economic benefit, but bring the welfare of bees into direct
195 conflict with industrial agriculture. Herbicides are highly effective at minimizing weed
196 problems in most cropping systems, enabling farmers to grow near-pure monocultures, but
197 their use inevitably reduces the availability of flowers for pollinators and can contribute
198 substantially to rendering farmland an inhospitable environment for bees (11, 58, 59).

199 Understandably, most attention has been paid to the direct toxic effects of pesticides on bees,
200 particularly the impacts of insecticides. One hundred and sixty one different pesticides have
201 been detected in honey bee colonies (60, 61) and based on their toxicity, frequency in hives
202 and the concentrations detected, Sanchez-Bayo and Goka (61) predict that three
203 neonicotinoids (thiamethoxam, imidacloprid and clothianidin), and the organophosphates
204 phosmet and chlorpyrifos pose the biggest risk to honey bees at a global scale. It is clear that
205 bees are often chronically exposed to cocktails of pesticides throughout their development
206 and adult life (61–64), but the effects of this are poorly understood and are not examined by
207 current regulatory risk-assessment procedures (65).

208 Neonicotinoids are the newest of the main classes of insecticide, and the group most
209 strongly implicated in bee declines (65, 66). They are neurotoxins that target the insect
210 central nervous system, binding to postsynaptic nicotinic acetylcholine receptors and causing
211 over-stimulation, paralysis and death (67). These insecticides are commonly applied as seed-
212 treatments and are systemic within plants, spreading through plant tissues and into the pollen
213 and nectar of flowering crops such as canola. They are also water soluble but highly
214 persistent in soil and soil water, and as a result have been found at significant concentrations
215 in the pollen and nectar of wildflowers near crops (63). Thus there is a clear route for
216 ingestion by bees. Oral toxicity is high, with the short-term LD₅₀ for the most commonly-
217 used neonicotinoids in the region of 4-5ng/honey bee (68) (LD₅₀ = Lethal Dose 50%, the
218 dose that kills 50% of test organisms). Long-term chronic exposure results in mortality in
219 overwintering honey bees when feeding on food contaminated with concentrations as low as
220 0.25ppb (69). Sub-lethal effects of neonicotinoid exposure have also been observed in both
221 honey bees and bumblebees, including a reduction in learning, foraging ability and homing
222 ability, all of which are essential to bee survival (70–74). Yang *et al.* (75) recently showed
223 that even low exposure during the larval stage (0.04ng/larva equating to less than 1/100th of
224 the LC₅₀ for adult bees) can have a lasting impact on learning in adult honey bees (LC₅₀ =
225 Lethal Concentration 50%, the concentration that kills 50% of test organisms).

226 It seems very likely that bees living in most arable farmland are routinely exposed to
227 sufficient neonicotinoids to suffer both lethal and sublethal effects. However, whether this
228 translates into a detrimental effect at the colony-level remains disputed. In bumblebees,
229 exposure of colonies to field-realistic concentrations of imidacloprid greatly impaired colony
230 growth and reduced queen production by 85% (76). In contrast, field studies with honey bee
231 colonies have proved more challenging to perform convincingly (77, 78), not least because of
232 the huge areas over which honey bees forage, the lack of a clear end-point to colony
233 development, and their long-term storage of food reserves. This lack of clear evidence of
234 harm in the field is often misinterpreted as evidence that toxicological studies on individual
235 bees do not translate into colony losses in the field, rather than as the absence of evidence.

236
237

238 Monotonous diets

239 Intensively farmed areas provide few wildflowers, but do provide spatially and temporally
240 isolated gluts of flowers in the form of mass-flowering crops such as sunflowers and canola.

241 If a human were to consume nothing but sardines one month, chocolate the next, turnips the
242 month after and so on, one could reasonably expect them to fall ill. This may seem a
243 frivolous example, but it is a reasonable parallel to the experience of some honey bee
244 colonies, particularly those in North America that are transported backwards and forwards
245 across the continent each year to provide pollination for major crops such as almonds in
246 California, blueberries in Maine and citrus in Florida. Where the nectar or pollen of crop
247 flowers contain toxins, such as the glycoside amygdalin found in almonds (79), bees might
248 potentially consume harmful concentrations of such substances.

249 More generally it seems certain that bees inhabiting intensive farmland have a more
250 monotonous diet than they would have experienced in their evolutionary past, but how this
251 impacts upon their fitness remains unclear. The pollen of different plant species varies greatly
252 in protein content, amino acid composition, lipid, starch, vitamin and mineral content. Nectar
253 commonly contains varying and low concentrations of a range of nutrients and other
254 compounds of largely unknown importance (80–84). Thus, we might expect the type and
255 range of flowers available will affect individual bee health and colony fitness in multiple
256 ways; for example in honey bees, both pollen quality and diversity influence longevity,
257 physiology and resistance/tolerance to disease (85–88). However, this topic has been little
258 investigated, particularly for wild bees. The perception that honey bees may be receiving an
259 inadequate diet has led to the development of protein supplements, but once again there has
260 been little research on the long-term effectiveness of such supplements on colony health (89,
261 90).

262 Interpreting the effects of availability of mass-flowering crops on bees and their
263 colonies is further complicated since visiting such crops often exposes bees to pesticide
264 residues, so that positive effects of increased food availability may be offset by negative
265 effects of the pesticide. Some studies have found positive effects of proximity to canola on
266 bumblebee colony growth and abundance (91, 92) and on numbers of nesting red mason bees
267 *Osmia bicornis* (93, 94) while others found no relationship for bumblebees (58, 95) nor for
268 solitary bees (96). Interestingly, none of these studies considered what role pesticides might
269 have played in mediating the effect of the crop, or even report which pesticides were applied
270 to crops in the study area, an omission that now seems naive given the recent focus on
271 impacts of neonicotinoid insecticides on bees.

272

273 Shipping fever

274 It seems reasonable to hypothesize that the long-distance transport of bees, as routinely
275 occurs for honey bees in North America and for commercial bumblebee colonies, places
276 stress on the colonies. For several days they may be confined and subject to vibration, high
277 temperatures, high levels of carbon dioxide and irregular disturbance. It has long been known
278 that such stress can activate bacterial and viral infections and generally reduce condition in
279 vertebrate livestock (97), but this has not been investigated in bees, although Bakonyi *et al.*
280 (98) suggest that shipping stress may have contributed to honey bee colony losses in
281 Hungary. This is clearly an area where further research is needed.

282

283

284 Competition

285 The role of competition in determining the relative abundance of species is notoriously hard
286 to ascertain in mobile organisms such as bees, but it seems likely that competition for floral
287 resources and perhaps also for nest sites does occur in natural communities, and that it can be
288 exacerbated by the introduction of non-native species, particularly when the latter are present
289 at high densities (57). For example, there is evidence that high concentrations of domestic
290 honey bee hives can displace wild bumblebees from their preferred foodplants and from
291 whole areas if hive densities are sufficiently high (99, 100). This can result in a reduction in
292 the size of bumblebee workers (101), and reduced reproductive success of bumblebee
293 colonies (102). Although in general the interests of honey bee keepers and wild bee
294 conservationists are aligned (all would agree on the benefits of increasing floral resources,
295 reducing exposure to pesticides and preventing invasions of alien pathogens), there may
296 occasionally be conflict where bee keepers wish to place hives in areas with significant
297 populations of rare wild bees (57).

298

299 Climate change

300 Climate change is widely accepted to pose one of the largest threats to biodiversity
301 worldwide, but likely impacts on pollinators and pollination are not well understood. One
302 danger is that the phenology of pollinators may diverge from that of the plants they pollinate,
303 with potentially disastrous consequences for both, but there is little evidence that this is
304 happening to a significant extent yet (103). Advances in flowering and bee emergence are
305 often broadly similar, and in any case few plants are dependent on a single pollinator so that

306 any mismatch with one pollinator is likely to be compensated by increased availability of
307 another (103, 104).

308 Another potential effect of climate change is as a driver of range shifts, leading to a
309 spatial mismatch between plants and pollinators. Range shifts in response to climate have
310 been demonstrated in butterflies (105) and are to be expected in bees (13); for example there
311 is already evidence that the lower altitudinal limit of some montane bumblebees has shifted
312 uphill in Spain (106). We would predict declines in bumblebees at the southern edge of their
313 range since they tend to be poorly adapted to high temperatures.

314 Of course climate change is not solely associated with warming; extreme weather
315 events such as storms, floods and droughts are predicted to increase, and we would expect
316 these to have major impacts on local bee communities. For example, flooding is likely to be
317 harmful to the many bee species that nest or hibernate underground.

318 Overall, although there is little strong evidence that climate change has yet had any
319 great effect on bees, it is likely to provide a growing source of stress in the future that would
320 exacerbate the impact of other factors, such as habitat loss.

321

322 **Interactions between stressors**

323 Unfortunately the public debate on bee health has often become polarized, with claims that,
324 for example, *Varroa* or neonicotinoid insecticides are the sole or primary cause of bee
325 declines or honey bee colony losses. If a middle-aged man who is overweight, does little
326 exercise, and smokes and drinks heavily were to die of a heart attack, we would not be
327 surprised and we might not spend too long arguing over which single risk factor was most
328 important in bringing about his untimely demise. Similarly, wild bee declines and honey bee
329 colony losses are clearly due to multiple, interacting and sometimes synergistic factors, and
330 the combination of factors involved no doubt varies in time and space.

331 In general, the combined effect of multiple stressors are likely to be more harmful than
332 one stressor alone (107–109) (Figure 3). In the worst-case scenario, sublethal stressors that do
333 not incur any significant harmful effects in isolation could, in combination, result in lethal
334 effects. As we have already seen, bees are often exposed chronically to mixtures of pesticides
335 and other chemicals. Some, such as ergosterol biosynthesis inhibitors (EBI) fungicides, have
336 very low toxicity in themselves but may increase the toxicity of some neonicotinoids and
337 pyrethroids up to 1,000-fold (110–112). Piperonyl butoxide is often added to pesticide
338 formulations and also acts synergistically with some neonicotinoids, increasing toxicity up to

339 244-fold (111). Intriguingly, whilst imidacloprid alone has been shown to impair olfactory
340 learning (113), combined exposure to imidacloprid and coumaphos has been shown to result
341 in a slight increase in learning in honey bees (114). So while regulatory processes examine
342 the effects on bees of exposure to a single pesticide at a time, in reality bees are
343 simultaneously exposed to many pesticides, some of which have combined effects that cannot
344 be predicted from studies of their effects when used in isolation.

345 Several recent studies indicate that interactive effects between pesticides and
346 pathogens could be especially harmful for bees (115–121). For instance, developmental
347 exposure to neonicotinoid insecticides renders honey bees more susceptible to the impact of
348 the invasive pathogen *N. ceranae* (122). Imidacloprid can act synergistically with *Nosema*
349 spp. by increasing the prevalence of *Nosema* infections in hives (116) and increasing
350 *Nosema*-induced mortality (115). Similarly, Aufauvre *et al.* (118) showed that mortality of
351 honey bees was greater when bees were exposed to the insecticide fipronil and infected by *N.*
352 *ceranae* than when only a single stress factor was present. There is evidence that exposure to
353 pesticides may impair the immune function of insects, which would explain these effects (43,
354 123–125). For example, Di Prisco *et al.* (126) recently showed that exposure to
355 neonicotinoids (clothianidin or imidacloprid) leads to immunosuppression in honey bees,
356 which, in turn, promotes the replication of the deformed wing virus in insects with covert
357 infections. This effect was found at very low concentrations, well below those that bees are
358 likely to encounter in the field.

359 Interactions between stressors are not confined to pesticides and pathogens. The
360 ability of bees to survive parasite infections is compromised by nutritional stress. For
361 example, *Crithidia bombi* causes little mortality in well-fed bumblebees, but becomes
362 virulent in bumblebees with a restricted diet (127). Activating the immune response has a
363 metabolic cost; bumblebees increase their food consumption when immune responses
364 are upregulated (128), and artificially stimulating the immune response by injecting latex
365 beads caused mortality in starving bumblebees but not in those that were well fed (129).
366 Increased food consumption in infected bees could also increase exposure to pesticides.
367 Activating immunity has been shown to impair learning in both honey bees (130) and
368 bumblebees (131, 132), and impaired learning will reduce the bees' ability to locate floral
369 resources and extract rewards, so exacerbating nutritional stresses.

370 Although to our knowledge this has not yet been examined, it seems highly likely that
371 nutritional stress may also modulate the ability of bees to cope with pesticides, and this may

372 explain in part why the observed LD50 of toxins in bees is highly variable across studies
373 (65).

374 In summary, stressors do not act in isolation. Bees of all species are likely to
375 encounter multiple stressors during their lives, and each is likely to reduce the ability of bees
376 to cope with the others. A bee or bee colony that appears to have succumbed to a pathogen
377 may not have died if it had not also been exposed to a sublethal dose of a pesticide and/or
378 been subject to food stress (which might in turn be due to drought or heavy rain induced by
379 climate change, or competition from a high density of honey bee hives placed nearby).
380 Unfortunately, conducting well-replicated studies of the effects of multiple, interacting
381 stressors on bee colonies is exceedingly difficult. The number of stressor combinations
382 rapidly become large, and exposure to stressors is hard or impossible to control with free-
383 flying bees. Nonetheless, a strong argument can be made that it is the interaction between
384 parasites, pesticides and diet that lies at the heart of current bee health problems.

385

386 **Sustainable pollination into the future**

387 There is universal agreement that we must ensure adequate pollinator populations into the
388 future if we wish to continue to grow a diversity of insect-pollinated crops and also ensure the
389 integrity of natural ecosystems. It is also clear that moving towards heavy reliance on a few
390 species of managed pollinators, such as honey bees or one or two species of bumblebee, runs
391 the risk of supply failure; for example, should honey bee stocks in North America fall much
392 further, the viability of almond production in California would be threatened (133). Wild
393 pollinators provide a service that is largely free, and globally already contributes the majority
394 of crop pollination (24, 25, 134, 135). Maintaining a diversity of pollinator species improves
395 crop success via functional complementarity; different species visit different parts of the crop
396 or crop plant, at different times of the day or year, and respond differently to environmental
397 perturbations (1, 136–141). A diversity of pollinators can buffer impacts of climate change
398 which might otherwise result in a mismatch in phenology of pollinators with the flowering of
399 crops (104). It is thus essential that we take steps to conserve a broad community of
400 pollinators in farmland.

401 Fortunately, although the causes of pollinator ill-health may be complex and multi-
402 causal, conserving pollinators need not be difficult or expensive. If we accept that declines
403 are due to interacting stressors, then it follows logically that removing or reducing any of the

404 stressors we have described is likely to benefit bee populations. Measures can be taken that
405 are likely to simultaneously benefit a broad suit of species, both domesticated and wild:

406

407 1) Increase abundance, diversity and continuity of floral resources. Schemes such as the
408 sowing of flower-rich field margins or hedgerows, or retaining patches of semi-
409 natural habitat among or near farmland provide clear benefits to bee diversity and
410 abundance (30, 141–148) (Fig. 4A). This in turn increases pollination to nearby crops
411 and provides an economic incentive to farmers growing insect-pollinated crops (149).
412 Many countries also offer financial incentives to farmers for taking measures to boost
413 biodiversity that help to offset implementation and opportunity costs. However, take-
414 up of schemes to boost pollinators remains low in most countries, perhaps reflecting a
415 lack of understanding of the economic and environmental benefits, or a lack of
416 familiarity with implementation of such measures. Education and outreach in this area
417 could pay great dividends for pollinator conservation.

418 Planting of appropriate flowers in gardens and amenity areas can also
419 contribute to pollinator conservation (150, 151) (Fig. 4B). There is evidence that
420 urban areas can support higher populations of some pollinators than farmland e.g.,
421 (36) and boost bee numbers in adjacent farmland (58). Many lists of bee or wildlife-
422 friendly flowers are available on the internet but they tend to be based on anecdote
423 rather than evidence, and there is a need to develop regionally appropriate, evidence-
424 based advice as to the best plants to grow (152).

425

426 2) Provide nest sites. Wild bees use a diversity of habitats for nesting, including
427 burrowing into bare soil, using existing cavities underground, holes in wood, or
428 hollow plant stems. Semi-natural habitats, hedgerows and permanently uncropped
429 field margins cater for many of these, meaning that schemes to boost floral diversity
430 are also likely to boost nesting opportunities (141). Additional nest sites can also be
431 provided by providing bundles of hollow reeds or canes, or patches of bare soil (153).

432

433 3) Reduce exposure to pesticides. Bees are currently chronically exposed to a cocktail of
434 pesticides some of which act synergistically. Since the late 1990s, the cost of
435 pesticides has fallen markedly relative to labor and fuel costs and the value of the
436 crops (154). As a result, current levels of pesticide use are generally high, and not

437 always justified by evidence that they are necessary to maintain yield (66, 155). The
438 widespread, prophylactic use of systemic insecticides, such as neonicotinoids as seed
439 dressings, exposes bees and other non-target wildlife, results in accumulation of
440 pesticides in the environment, and places strong selection pressure on pests to evolve
441 resistance. A return to the principles of Integrated Pest Management (156), which
442 utilizes preventative methods, such as crop rotation, and views the use of pesticides as
443 a last resort in the battle against insect pests, could greatly reduce exposure of bees,
444 benefit the environment, and improve farming profitability. Some European countries
445 have independently developed national pesticide reduction programs (156), and the
446 European Union Sustainable Use of Pesticides Directive (Anon 2009) required
447 member states to implement national action plans to minimize pesticide use by
448 January 2014. In most EU states this directive appears to have had little or no impact
449 on farming practices.

450 Current risk assessment procedures, which examine the short-term impact of a
451 single pesticide in isolation, are clearly not adequate to encapsulate the true scenario
452 faced by bees living in farmland. Improvements are needed to make them more
453 realistic, whilst keeping the cost of regulatory tests affordable, posing a considerable
454 challenge to the ingenuity of scientists and regulators.

455 The EU moratorium on the use of three neonicotinoids (which started in
456 December 2013) is an attempt to use policy change to reduce exposure of bees to
457 stressors, following a review by the European Food Standards Agency (157–159)
458 which declared that neonicotinoids pose an “unacceptable risk” to bees. However, if
459 this simply leads farmers to replace neonicotinoids with other pesticides this may not
460 be of great benefit to bees or the environment. Funding for research and for the
461 provision of clear, independent advice for farmers with regard to how to reduce
462 pesticide use generally by adopting IPM practices might provide a better and more
463 sustainable long-term solution.

464

465 4) Prevent further introductions of non-native bees, parasites and pathogens. The
466 careless disregard with which we ship bees from country to country has resulted in the
467 irreversible spread of many serious parasites and pathogens. Strict quarantine controls
468 should be implemented on the movement of all commercial bees, and there is an
469 urgent need to develop means of rearing commercial bumblebees that are free from

470 disease. Deliberate introductions of non-native bee species (such as the recent
471 introduction of the European *Bombus terrestris* to South America) should of course be
472 prevented. The companies that rear commercial bees should bear some responsibility
473 here, and refuse to sell bees to regions where they are not native. There is clear
474 hypocrisy in the policies of countries that prevent importation of non-native species
475 but allow exportation of species to places where they do not naturally occur.

476

477 5) Develop monitoring programs. We have good distribution maps for pollinators in
478 some countries, particularly for bumblebees, and citizen science schemes such as
479 “Bumble Bee Watch” in North America and “Beewatch” in the UK can help to track
480 changes in these distributions. However, the lack of long-term data on pollinator
481 abundance is a glaring knowledge gap that urgently needs to be filled. It will probably
482 never be possible to monitor all pollinator species at a global scale, but it would be
483 practical to systematically collect data on the abundance of a subset of the more
484 abundant and economically important pollinators. Citizen science surveys can provide
485 a cost effective means for large-scale population monitoring; for example the UK
486 butterfly monitoring scheme employs volunteers to walk regular transects using a
487 standard methodology to count the butterflies seen, and has generated a large and
488 long-term data set which has provided powerful insights into insect population change
489 (160, 161). “Beewalks”, a similar scheme to count bumblebees, has been launched by
490 the Bumblebee Conservation Trust to obtain population data for bumblebees in the
491 UK, although it is still in its infancy. In the USA, “The Great Sunflower Project” asks
492 volunteers to count pollinators in flower patches in their local area. However, such
493 schemes are limited by the taxonomic skills of volunteers, particularly for the many
494 pollinator taxa that are hard or impossible to identify in the field. LeBuhn *et al.* (162)
495 argue that a pan-tapping network, which could employ citizen scientists to place out
496 the traps but experts to identify the catch, would be the most cost-effective means for
497 monitoring a large cross-section of pollinator species on a large geographic scale.
498 Indeed, for a relatively modest sum it would be possible to set up an international pan-
499 trapping network to monitor pollinators following a standard methodology. Until
500 good population data become available, we cannot identify species or regions under
501 most threat and hence we cannot prioritize management.

502 In the absence of pollinator monitoring, we have no early warning system to tell us how close
503 we may be to a pollination crisis. With a growing human population and rapid growth in
504 global demand for pollination services, we cannot afford to see crop yields begin to fall, and
505 we would be well advised to take pre-emptive action to ensure that we have adequate
506 pollination services into the future.

507

508 **Acknowledgements**

509 Thanks are due to Rich Hatfield and Sarina Jepsen for their help with Figure 1b.

- 510 1. A.-M. Klein, I. Steffan-Dewenter, T. Tscharntke, Fruit set of highland coffee increases
511 with the diversity of pollinating bees. *Proc. Biol. Sci.* **270**, 955–961 (2003).
- 512 2. N. Gallai, J.-M. Salles, J. Settele, B. E. Vaissière, Economic valuation of the
513 vulnerability of world agriculture confronted with pollinator decline. *Ecol. Econ.* **68**,
514 810–821 (2009).
- 515 3. C. Holden, Report warns of looming pollination crisis in North America. *Science.* **314**,
516 397 (2006).
- 517 4. M. Gross, Bee gloom deepens. *Curr. Biol.* **18**, 1073 (2008).
- 518 5. S. G. Potts *et al.*, Declines of managed honey bees and beekeepers in Europe. *J. Apic.*
519 *Res.*, 15–22 (2010).
- 520 6. National Resource Council, *Status of Pollinators in North America* (National
521 Academies Press, 2007).
- 522 7. D. van Engelsdorp, J. Hayes, R. M. Underwood, J. Pettis, A survey of honey bee
523 colony losses in the U.S., fall 2007 to spring 2008. *PLoS One.* **3**, e4071 (2008).
- 524 8. M. A. Aizen, L. D. Harder, The global stock of domesticated honey bees is growing
525 slower than agricultural demand for pollination. *Curr. Biol.* **19**, 915–918 (2009).
- 526 9. D. vanEngelsdorp *et al.*, Colony collapse disorder: A descriptive study. *PLoS One.* **4**,
527 e6481 (2009).
- 528 10. K. M. Smith *et al.*, Pathogens, pests, and economics: drivers of honey bee colony
529 declines and losses. *Ecohealth.* **10**, 434–45 (2013).
- 530 11. D. Goulson, G. C. Lye, B. Darvill, Decline and conservation of bumble bees. *Annu.*
531 *Rev. Entomol.* **53**, 191–208 (2008).
- 532 12. A. Kosior *et al.*, The decline of the bumble bees and cuckoo bees (Hymenoptera:
533 Apidae: Bombini) of Western and Central Europe. *Oryx.* **41**, 79–88 (2007).

- 534 13. P. H. Williams, J. L. Osborne, Bumblebee vulnerability and conservation world-wide.
535 *Apidologie*. **40**, 367–387 (2009).
- 536 14. P. H. Williams, R. W. Thorp, L. L. Richardson, S. R. Colla, *Bumble Bees of North*
537 *America: An Identification Guide* (Princeton University Press, 2014).
- 538 15. J. C. Grixti, L. T. Wong, S. A. Cameron, C. Favret, Decline of bumble bees (*Bombus*)
539 in the North American Midwest. *Biol. Conserv.* **142**, 75–84 (2009).
- 540 16. R. Schmid-Hempel *et al.*, The invasion of southern South America by imported
541 bumblebees and associated parasites. *J. Anim. Ecol.* **83**, 823–837 (2014).
- 542 17. Z. Xie, P. H. Williams, Y. Tang, The effect of grazing on bumblebees in the high
543 rangelands of the eastern Tibetan Plateau of Sichuan. *J. Insect Conserv.* **12**, 695–703
544 (2008).
- 545 18. P. Williams, Y. Tang, J. Yao, S. Cameron, The bumblebees of Sichuan (Hymenoptera:
546 Apidae, Bombini). *Syst. Biodivers.* **7**, 101–189 (2009).
- 547 19. C. Matsumura, J. Yokoyama, I. Washitani, Invasion status and potential ecological
548 impacts of an invasive alien bumblebee, *Bombus terrestris* L. (Hymenoptera : Apidae
549) naturalized in Southern Hokkaido , Japan. *Glob. Environ. Res.* **8**, 51 – 66 (2004).
- 550 20. M. N. Inoue, J. Yokoyama, I. Washitani, Displacement of Japanese native bumblebees
551 by the recently introduced *Bombus terrestris* (L.) (Hymenoptera: Apidae). *J. Insect*
552 *Conserv.* **12**, 135–146 (2008).
- 553 21. L. G. Carvalheiro *et al.*, Species richness declines and biotic homogenisation have
554 slowed down for NW-European pollinators and plants. *Ecol. Lett.* **16**, 870–878 (2013).
- 555 22. J. C. Biesmeijer *et al.*, Parallel declines in pollinators and insect pollinated plants in
556 Britain and the Netherlands. *Science*. **313**, 351–354 (2006).
- 557 23. L. A. Burkle, J. C. Marlin, T. M. Knight, Plant-pollinator interactions over 120 years:
558 loss of species, co-occurrence, and function. *Science*. **339**, 1611–1615 (2013).
- 559 24. T. D. Breeze, a. P. Bailey, K. G. Balcombe, S. G. Potts, Pollination services in the UK:
560 How important are honeybees? *Agric. Ecosyst. Environ.* **142**, 137–143 (2011).
- 561 25. L. A. Garibaldi *et al.*, Wild pollinators enhance fruit set of crops regardless of honey
562 bee abundance. *Science*. **339**, 1608–1611 (2013).
- 563 26. R. E. Mallinger, C. Gratton, *J. Appl. Ecol.*, **in press**, doi:10.1111/1365-2664.12377. IS
564 THIS NOW PUBLISHED? PLEASE ADD DETAILS - CANNOT BE INCLUDED IF
565 NOT PUBLISHED - **It is available online, but there are no page numbers yet:**
566 <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/1365-2664.12377/abstract>. **Is this**
567 **acceptable?**
- 568 27. C. A. Kearns, D. W. Inouye, N. M. Waser, Endangered mutualisms: The conservation
569 of plant-pollinator interactions. *Annu. Rev. Ecol. Syst.* **29**, 83–112 (1998).

- 570 28. M. A. Aizen, L. A. Garibaldi, S. A. Cunningham, A. M. Klein, Long-term global
571 trends in crop yield and production reveal no current pollination shortage but
572 increasing pollinator dependency. *Curr. Biol.* **18**, 1572–1575 (2008).
- 573 29. L. A. Garibaldi, M. A. Aizen, A. M. Klein, S. A. Cunningham, L. D. Harder, Global
574 growth and stability of agricultural yield decrease with pollinator dependence. *Proc.*
575 *Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **108**, 5909–5914 (2011).
- 576 30. L. A. Garibaldi *et al.*, Stability of pollination services decreases with isolation from
577 natural areas despite honey bee visits. *Ecol. Lett.* **14**, 1062–1072 (2011).
- 578 31. M. J. F. Brown, R. J. Paxton, The conservation of bees: a global perspective.
579 *Apidologie.* **40**, 410–416 (2009).
- 580 32. S. G. Potts *et al.*, Global pollinator declines: trends, impacts and drivers. *Trends Ecol.*
581 *Evol.* **25**, 345–53 (2010).
- 582 33. A. J. Vanbergen, Threats to an ecosystem service: pressures on pollinators. *Front.*
583 *Ecol. Environ.*, 251–259 (2013).
- 584 34. D. C. Howard, J. W. Watkins, R. T. Clarke, C. L. Barnett, G. J. Stark, Estimating the
585 extent and change in broad habitats in Great Britain. *J. Environ. Manage.* **67**, 219–227
586 (2003).
- 587 35. F. Samson, F. Knopf, Prairie conservation in North America. *Bioscience.* **44**, 418–421
588 (1994).
- 589 36. J. L. Osborne *et al.*, Quantifying and comparing bumblebee nest densities in gardens
590 and countryside habitats. *J. Appl. Ecol.* **45**, 784–792 (2008).
- 591 37. A. J. Bates *et al.*, Changing bee and hoverfly pollinator assemblages along an urban-
592 rural gradient. *PLoS One.* **6**, e23459 (2011).
- 593 38. P. Skórka, M. Lenda, D. Moroń, K. Kalarus, P. Tryjanowski, Factors affecting road
594 mortality and the suitability of road verges for butterflies. *Biol. Conserv.* **159**, 148–157
595 (2013).
- 596 39. E. Genersch, American Foulbrood in honeybees and its causative agent, *Paenibacillus*
597 larvae. *J. Invertebr. Pathol.* **103**, S10-S19 (2010).
- 598 40. E. Genersch, C. Yue, I. Fries, J. R. De Miranda, Detection of *Deformed wing virus*, a
599 honey bee viral pathogen, in bumble bees (*Bombus terrestris* and *Bombus pascuorum*)
600 with wing deformities. *J. Invertebr. Pathol.* **91**, 61–63 (2006).
- 601 41. P. Graystock, K. Yates, B. Darvill, D. Goulson, W. O. H. Hughes, Emerging dangers:
602 deadly effects of an emergent parasite in a new pollinator host. *J. Invertebr. Pathol.*
603 **114**, 114–119 (2013).
- 604 42. P. Rosenkranz, P. Aumeier, B. Ziegelmann, Biology and control of *Varroa destructor*.
605 *J. Invertebr. Pathol.* **103**, S96-S119 (2010).

- 606 43. F. Nazzi *et al.*, Synergistic parasite-pathogen interactions mediated by host immunity
607 can drive the collapse of honeybee colonies. *PLoS Pathog.* **8**, e1002735 (2012).
- 608 44. J. Klee *et al.*, Widespread dispersal of the microsporidian *Nosema ceranae*, an
609 emergent pathogen of the western honey bee, *Apis mellifera*. *J. Invertebr. Pathol.* **96**,
610 1–10 (2007).
- 611 45. Y. Chen, J. D. Evans, I. B. Smith, J. S. Pettis, *Nosema ceranae* is a long-present and
612 wide-spread microsporidian infection of the European honey bee (*Apis mellifera*) in
613 the United States. *J. Invertebr. Pathol.* **97**, 186–8 (2008).
- 614 46. J. Li *et al.*, Diversity of *Nosema* associated with bumblebees (*Bombus* spp.) from
615 China. *Int. J. Parasitol.* **42**, 49–61 (2012).
- 616 47. S. Plischuk *et al.*, South American native bumblebees (Hymenoptera: Apidae) infected
617 by *Nosema ceranae* (Microsporidia), an emerging pathogen of honeybees (*Apis*
618 *mellifera*). *Environ. Microbiol. Rep.* **1**, 131–5 (2009).
- 619 48. J. Ravoet *et al.*, Widespread occurrence of honey bee pathogens in solitary bees. *J.*
620 *Invertebr. Pathol.* **122**, 55–8 (2014).
- 621 49. S. Spiewok, P. Neumann, Infestation of commercial bumblebee (*Bombus impatiens*)
622 field colonies by small hive beetles (*Aethina tumida*). *Ecol. Entomol.* **31**, 623–628
623 (2006).
- 624 50. D. Hoffmann, J. S. Pettis, P. Neumann, Potential host shift of the small hive beetle
625 (*Aethina tumida*) to bumblebee colonies (*Bombus impatiens*). *Insectes Soc.* **55**, 153–
626 162 (2008).
- 627 51. S. A. Cameron *et al.*, Patterns of widespread decline in North American bumble bees.
628 *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **108**, 662–667 (2011).
- 629 52. I. Meeus, M. J. F. Brown, D. C. De Graaf, G. Smagghe, Effects of invasive parasites
630 on bumble bee declines. *Conserv. Biol.* **25**, 662–671 (2011).
- 631 53. M. P. Arbetman, I. Meeus, C. L. Morales, M. A. Aizen, G. Smagghe, Alien parasite
632 hitchhikes to Patagonia on invasive bumblebee. *Biol. Invasions.* **15**, 489–494 (2013).
- 633 54. S. R. Colla, M. C. Otterstatter, R. J. Gegear, J. D. Thomson, Plight of the bumble bee:
634 Pathogen spillover from commercial to wild populations. *Biol. Conserv.* **129**, 461–467
635 (2006).
- 636 55. M. C. Otterstatter, J. D. Thomson, Does pathogen spillover from commercially reared
637 bumble bees threaten wild pollinators? *PLoS One.* **3**, DOI:
638 10.1371/journal.pone.0002771 (2008).
- 639 56. M. Y. Yoneda, H. F. Uruta, K. T. Suchida, K. O. Kabe, K. G. Oka, Commercial
640 colonies of *Bombus terrestris* (Hymenopter: Apidae) are reservoirs of the tracheal mite
641 *Locustacarus buchneri* (Acari: Podapolipidae). *Appl. Entomol. Zool.* **43**, 73–76 (2008).

- 642 57. D. Goulson, Effects of introduced bees on native ecosystems. *Annu. Rev. Ecol. Evol.*
643 *Syst.* **34**, 1–26 (2003).
- 644 58. D. Goulson *et al.*, Effects of land use at a landscape scale on bumblebee nest density
645 and survival. *J. Appl. Ecol.* **47**, 1207–1215 (2010).
- 646 59. L. A. Morandin, M. L. Winston, Wild bee abundance and seed production in
647 conventional, organic, and genetically modified canola. *Ecol. Appl.* **15**, 871–881
648 (2005).
- 649 60. A. M. Chauzat *et al.*, A survey of pesticide residues in pollen loads collected by honey
650 bees in France. *J. Econ. Entomol.* **99**, 253–262 (2006).
- 651 61. F. Sanchez-Bayo, K. Goka, Pesticide residues and bees--a risk assessment. *PLoS One.*
652 **9**, e94482–e94482 (2014).
- 653 62. C. A. Mullin *et al.*, High levels of miticides and agrochemicals in North American
654 apiaries: implications for honey bee health. *PLoS One.* **5**, e9754–e9754 (2010).
- 655 63. C. H. Krupke, G. J. Hunt, B. D. Eitzer, G. Andino, K. Given, Multiple routes of
656 pesticide exposure for honey bees living near agricultural fields. *PLoS One.* **7**,
657 e29268–e29268 (2012).
- 658 64. D. Paradis, G. Bérail, J. M. Bonmatin, L. P. Belzunces, Sensitive analytical methods
659 for 22 relevant insecticides of 3 chemical families in honey by GC-MS/MS and LC-
660 MS/MS. *Anal. Bioanal. Chem.* **406**, 621–633 (2014).
- 661 65. L. W. Pisa *et al.*, Effects of neonicotinoids and fipronil on non-target invertebrates.
662 *Environ. Sci. Pollut. Res. Int.*, 1–35 (2014).
- 663 66. D. Goulson, An overview of the environmental risks posed by neonicotinoid
664 insecticides. *J. Appl. Ecol.* **50**, 977–987 (2013).
- 665 67. M. Tomizawa, J. E. Casida, Neonicotinoid insecticide toxicology: mechanisms of
666 selective action. *Annu. Rev. Pharmacol. Toxicol.* **45**, 247–268 (2005).
- 667 68. S. Suchail, D. Guez, L. P. Belzunces, Characteristics of imidacloprid toxicity in two
668 *Apis mellifera* subspecies. *Environ. Toxicol. Chem.* **19**, 1901–1905 (2000).
- 669 69. G. Rondeau *et al.*, Delayed and time-cumulative toxicity of imidacloprid in bees, ants
670 and termites. *Sci. Rep.* **4**, 5566 (2014).
- 671 70. E. C. Yang, Y. C. Chuang, Y. L. Chen, L. H. Chang, A. E. C. Yang, Abnormal
672 foraging behavior induced by sublethal dosage of imidacloprid in the honey bee
673 (Hymenoptera: Apidae). *J. Econ. Entomol.* **101**, 1743–1748 (2008).
- 674 71. V. Mommaerts *et al.*, Risk assessment for side-effects of neonicotinoids against
675 bumblebees with and without impairing foraging behavior. *Ecotoxicology.* **19**, 207–
676 215 (2010).

- 677 72. M. Henry *et al.*, A common pesticide decreases foraging success and survival in honey
678 bees. *Science*. **336**, 348–350 (2012).
- 679 73. H. Feltham, K. Park, D. Goulson, Field realistic doses of pesticide imidacloprid reduce
680 bumblebee pollen foraging efficiency. *Ecotoxicology*. **23**, 317–323 (2014).
- 681 74. P. Han, C. Y. Niu, C. L. Lei, J. J. Cui, N. Desneux, Quantification of toxins in a
682 Cry1Ac + CpTI cotton cultivar and its potential effects on the honey bee *Apis mellifera*
683 L. *Ecotoxicology*. **19**, 1452–1459 (2010).
- 684 75. E. C. Yang, H. C. Chang, W. Y. Wu, Y. W. Chen, Impaired olfactory associative
685 behavior of honeybee workers due to contamination of imidacloprid in the larval stage.
686 *PLoS One*. **7**, e49472 (2012).
- 687 76. P. R. Whitehorn, S. O’Connor, F. L. Wackers, D. Goulson, Neonicotinoid pesticide
688 reduces bumble bee colony growth and queen production. *Science*. **336**, 351–352
689 (2012).
- 690 77. G. C. Cutler, C. D. Scott-dupree, Exposure to clothianidin seed-treated canola has no
691 long-term impact on honey bees. *J. Econ. Entomol.* **100**, 765–772 (2007).
- 692 78. E. Pilling, P. Campbell, M. Coulson, N. Ruddle, I. Tornier, A four-year field program
693 investigating long-term effects of repeated exposure of honey bee colonies to
694 flowering crops treated with thiamethoxam. *PLoS One*. **8**, e77193–e77193 (2013).
- 695 79. I. London-Shafir, S. Shafir, D. Eisikowitch, Amygdalin in almond nectar and pollen-
696 facts and possible roles. *Plant Syst. Evol.* **238**, 87–95 (2003).
- 697 80. R. G. Stanley, H. F. Linskens, *Pollen: Biology, Biochemistry, Management* (Springer-
698 Verlag, Berlin, 1974).
- 699 81. T. H. Roulston, S. L. Buchmann, A phylogenetic reconsideration of the pollen starch-
700 pollination correlation. *Evol. Ecol. Res.* **2**, 627–643 (2000).
- 701 82. M. E. Hanley, M. Franco, S. Pichon, B. Darvill, D. Goulson, Breeding system,
702 pollinator choice and variation in pollen quality in British herbaceous plants. *Funct.*
703 *Ecol.* **22**, 592–598 (2008).
- 704 83. G. A. Wright *et al.*, Caffeine in floral nectar enhances a pollinator’s memory of
705 reward. *Science*. **339**, 1202–4 (2013).
- 706 84. W. Mao, M. a Schuler, M. R. Berenbaum, Honey constituents up-regulate
707 detoxification and immunity genes in the western honey bee *Apis mellifera*. *Proc. Natl.*
708 *Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **110**, 8842–6 (2013).
- 709 85. A. Maurizio, The influence of pollen feeding and brood rearing on the length of life
710 and physiological condition of the honeybee. *Bee World*. **31**, 9–12 (1950).

- 711 86. L. N. Standifer, A comparison of the protein quality of pollens for growth-stimulation
712 of the hypopharyngeal glands and longevity of honey bees, *Apis mellifera* L.
713 (Hymenoptera: Apidae). *Insectes Soc.* **14**, 415–425 (1967).
- 714 87. L. S. Schmidt, J. O. Schmidt, H. Rao, W. Wang, L. Xu, Feeding preference and
715 survival of young worker honeybees (Hymenoptera: Apidae) fed rape, sesame, and
716 sunflower pollen. *J. Econ. Entomol.* **88**, 1591–1595 (1995).
- 717 88. G. Di Pasquale *et al.*, Influence of pollen nutrition on honey bee health: do pollen
718 quality and diversity matter? *PLoS One.* **8**, e72016 (2013).
- 719 89. M. M. Morais *et al.*, Evaluation of inexpensive pollen substitute diets through
720 quantification of haemolymph proteins. *J. Apic. Res.* **52**, 119 (2013)
- 721 90. R. Kumar, R. C. Mishra, O. P. Agrawal, Effect of feeding artificial diets to honey bees
722 during dearth period under Panchkula (Haryana) conditions. *J. Entomol. Res.* **37**, 41–
723 46 (2013).
- 724 91. M. E. Knight *et al.*, Bumblebee nest density and the scale of available forage in arable
725 landscapes. *Insect Conserv. Divers.* **2**, 116–124 (2009).
- 726 92. C. Westphal, I. Steffan-Dewenter, T. Tschardt, Mass flowering oilseed rape
727 improves early colony growth but not sexual reproduction of bumblebees. *J. Appl.*
728 *Ecol.* **46**, 187–193 (2009).
- 729 93. F. Jauker, F. Peter, V. Wolters, T. Diekötter, Early reproductive benefits of mass-
730 flowering crops to the solitary bee *Osmia rufa* outbalance post-flowering
731 disadvantages. *Basic Appl. Ecol.* **13**, 268–276 (2012).
- 732 94. A. Holzschuh, C. F. Dormann, T. Tschardt, I. Steffan-Dewenter, Mass-flowering
733 crops enhance wild bee abundance. *Oecologia.* **172**, 477–484 (2013).
- 734 95. F. Herrmann, C. Westphal, R. F. A. Moritz, I. Steffan-Dewenter, Genetic diversity and
735 mass resources promote colony size and forager densities of a social bee (*Bombus*
736 *pascuorum*) in agricultural landscapes. *Mol. Ecol.* **16**, 1167–1178 (2007).
- 737 96. A. Kovács-Hostyánszki *et al.*, Contrasting effects of mass-flowering crops on bee
738 pollination of hedge plants at different spatial and temporal scales. *Ecol. Appl.* **23**,
739 1938–1946 (2013).
- 740 97. W. D. Yates, A review of infectious bovine rhinotracheitis, shipping fever pneumonia
741 and viral-bacterial synergism in respiratory disease of cattle. *Can. J. Comp. Med.* **46**,
742 225–263 (1982).
- 743 98. T. Bakonyi, R. Farkas, A. Szendroi, M. Dobos Kovacs, M. Rusvai, Detection of acute
744 bee paralysis virus by RT-PCR in honey bee and *Varroa destructor* field samples:
745 rapid screening of representative Hungarian apiaries. *Apidologie.* **33**, 63–74 (2002).
- 746 99. M. L. Forup, J. Memmott, The relationship between the abundance of bumblebees and
747 honeybees in a native habitat. *Ecol. Entomol.* **30**, 47–57 (2005).

- 748 100. K. Walther-Hellwig *et al.*, Increased density of honeybee colonies affects foraging
749 bumblebees. *Apidologie*. **37**, 517–532 (2006).
- 750 101. D. Goulson, K. R. Sparrow, Evidence for competition between honeybees and
751 bumblebees; effects on bumblebee worker size. *J. Insect Conserv.* **13**, 177–181 (2008).
- 752 102. D. M. Thomson, Detecting the effects of introduced species: A case study of
753 competition between *Apis* and *Bombus*. *Oikos*. **114**, 407–418 (2006).
- 754 103. P. Willmer, Pollinator-plant synchrony tested by climate change. *Curr. Biol.* **22**,
755 R131–R132 (2012).
- 756 104. I. Bartomeus *et al.*, Biodiversity ensures plant-pollinator phenological synchrony
757 against climate change. *Ecol. Lett.* **16**, 1331–1338 (2013).
- 758 105. M. L. Forister *et al.*, Compounded effects of climate change and habitat alteration shift
759 patterns of butterfly diversity. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **107**, 2088–2092 (2010).
- 760 106. E. F. Ploquin, J. M. Herrera, J. R. Obeso, Bumblebee community homogenization after
761 uphill shifts in montane areas of northern Spain. *Oecologia*. **173**, 1649–1660 (2013).
- 762 107. A. Sih, A. M. Bell, J. L. Kerby, Two stressors are far deadlier than one. *Trends Ecol.*
763 *Evol.* **19**, 274–276 (2004)
- 764 108. A. Coors, L. De Meester, Synergistic, antagonistic and additive effects of multiple
765 stressors: Predation threat, parasitism and pesticide exposure in *Daphnia magna*. *J.*
766 *Appl. Ecol.* **45**, 1820–1828 (2008).
- 767 109. R. J. Gill, O. Ramos-Rodriguez, N. E. Raine, Combined pesticide exposure severely
768 affects individual- and colony-level traits in bees. *Nature*. **491**, 105–108 (2012).
- 769 110. R. Schmuck, T. Stadler, H. W. Schmidt, Field relevance of a synergistic effect
770 observed in the laboratory between an EBI fungicide and a chloronicotinyl insecticide
771 in the honeybee (*Apis mellifera* L, Hymenoptera). *Pest Manag. Sci.* **59**, 279–286
772 (2003).
- 773 111. T. Iwasa, N. Motoyama, J. T. Ambrose, R. M. M. Roe, Mechanism for the differential
774 toxicity of neonicotinoid insecticides in the honey bee, *Apis mellifera*. *Crop Prot.* **23**,
775 371–378 (2004).
- 776 112. E. D. Pilling, P. C. Jepson, Synergism between EBI fungicides and a pyrethroid
777 insecticide in the honeybee (*Apis mellifera*). *Pestic. Sci.* **39**, 293–297 (1993).
- 778 113. A. Decourtye *et al.*, Imidacloprid impairs memory and brain metabolism in the
779 honeybee (*Apis mellifera* L.). *Pestic. Biochem. Physiol.* **78**, 83–92 (2004).
- 780 114. S. M. Williamson, G. A. Wright, Exposure to multiple cholinergic pesticides impairs
781 olfactory learning and memory in honeybees. *J. Exp. Biol.* **216**, 1799–1807 (2013).

- 782 115. C. Alaux *et al.*, Interactions between *Nosema* microspores and a neonicotinoid weaken
783 honeybees (*Apis mellifera*). *Environ. Microbiol.* **12**, 774–782 (2010).
- 784 116. J. S. Pettis, D. VanEngelsdorp, J. Johnson, G. Dively, Pesticide exposure in honey bees
785 results in increased levels of the gut pathogen *Nosema*. *Naturwissenschaften.* **99**, 153–
786 158 (2012).
- 787 117. C. Vidau *et al.*, Exposure to sublethal doses of fipronil and thiacloprid highly increases
788 mortality of honeybees previously infected by *Nosema ceranae*. *PLoS One.* **6**, e21550
789 (2011).
- 790 118. J. Aufauvre *et al.*, Parasite-insecticide interactions: a case study of *Nosema ceranae*
791 and fipronil synergy on honeybee. *Sci. Rep.* **2**, 326 (2012).
- 792 119. G. L. Baron, N. E. Raine, M. J. F. Brown, Impact of chronic exposure to a pyrethroid
793 pesticide on bumblebees and interactions with a trypanosome parasite. *J. Appl. Ecol.*
794 **51**, 460–469 (2014).
- 795 120. A. Fauser-Misslin, B. M. Sadd, P. Neumann, C. Sandrock, Influence of combined
796 pesticide and parasite exposure on bumblebee colony traits in the laboratory. *J. Appl.*
797 *Ecol.* **51**, 450–459 (2014).
- 798 121. V. Doublet, M. Labarussias, J. R. de Miranda, R. F. A. Moritz, R. J. Paxton, Bees
799 under stress: sublethal doses of a neonicotinoid pesticide and pathogens interact to
800 elevate honey bee mortality across the life cycle. *Environ. Microbiol.*, in press,
801 doi:10.1111/1462-2920.12426. As above, it is now online at
802 <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/1462-2920.12426/abstract>
- 803 122. J. Y. Wu, M. D. Smart, C. M. Anelli, W. S. Sheppard, Honey bees (*Apis mellifera*)
804 reared in brood combs containing high levels of pesticide residues exhibit increased
805 susceptibility to *Nosema* (Microsporidia) infection. *J. Invertebr. Pathol.* **109**, 326–329
806 (2012).
- 807 123. R. R. James, J. Xu, Mechanisms by which pesticides affect insect immunity. *J.*
808 *Invertebr. Pathol.* **109**, 175–182 (2012).
- 809 124. F. S. Brunner, P. Schmid-Hempel, S. M. Barribeau, Immune gene expression in
810 *Bombus terrestris*: signatures of infection despite strong variation among populations,
811 colonies, and sister workers. *PLoS One.* **8**, e68181 (2013).
- 812 125. H. Boncristiani *et al.*, Direct effect of acaricides on pathogen loads and gene
813 expression levels in honey bees *Apis mellifera*. *J. Insect Physiol.* **58**, 613–620 (2012).
- 814 126. G. Di Prisco *et al.*, Neonicotinoid clothianidin adversely affects insect immunity and
815 promotes replication of a viral pathogen in honey bees. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*
816 **110**, 18466–18471 (2013).
- 817 127. M. J. F. Brown, R. Loosli, P. Schmid-Hempel, Condition-dependent expression of
818 virulence in a trypanosome infecting bumblebees. *Oikos.* **91**, 421–427 (2000).

- 819 128. E. R. Tyler, S. Adams, E. B. Mallon, An immune response in the bumblebee, *Bombus*
820 *terrestris* leads to increased food consumption. *BMC Physiol.* **6**, 6 (2006).
- 821 129. Y. Moret, P. Schmid-Hempel, Survival for immunity: the price of immune system
822 activation for bumblebee workers. *Science.* **290**, 1166–1168 (2000).
- 823 130. E. B. Mallon, A. Brockmann, P. Schmid-Hempel, Immune response inhibits
824 associative learning in insects. *Proc. Biol. Sci.* **270**, 2471–2473 (2003).
- 825 131. C. E. Riddell, E. B. Mallon, Insect psychoneuroimmunology: Immune response
826 reduces learning in protein starved bumblebees (*Bombus terrestris*). *Brain. Behav.*
827 *Immun.* **20**, 135–138 (2006).
- 828 132. A. Alghamdi, L. Dalton, A. Phillis, E. Rosato, E. B. Mallon, Immune response impairs
829 learning in free-flying bumble-bees. *Biol. Lett.* **4**, 479–481 (2008).
- 830 133. D. Vanengelsdorp, M. D. Meixner, A historical review of managed honey bee
831 populations in Europe and the United States and the factors that may affect them. *J.*
832 *Invertebr. Pathol.* **103**, S80–95 (2010).
- 833 134. R. Winfree, C. Kremen, Are ecosystem services stabilized by differences among
834 species? A test using crop pollination. *Proc. Biol. Sci.* **276**, 229–237 (2009).
- 835 135. R. Rader, B. G. Howlett, S. A. Cunningham, D. A. Westcott, W. Edwards, Spatial and
836 temporal variation in pollinator effectiveness: Do unmanaged insects provide
837 consistent pollination services to mass flowering crops? *J. Appl. Ecol.* **49**, 126–134
838 (2012).
- 839 136. P. Hoehn, T. Tschardt, J. M. Tylianakis, I. Steffan-Dewenter, Functional group
840 diversity of bee pollinators increases crop yield. *Proc. Biol. Sci.* **275**, 2283–2291
841 (2008).
- 842 137. J. K. Tuell, R. Isaacs, Community and species-specific responses of wild bees to insect
843 pest control programs applied to a pollinator-dependent crop. *J. Econ. Entomol.* **103**,
844 668–675 (2010).
- 845 138. N. Blüthgen, A. M. Klein, Functional complementarity and specialisation: The role of
846 biodiversity in plant-pollinator interactions. *Basic Appl. Ecol.* **12**, 282–291 (2011).
- 847 139. C. Brittain, N. Williams, C. Kremen, A. Klein, Synergistic effects of non-*Apis* bees
848 and honey bees for pollination services. *Proc. Biol. Sci.* **280**, 20122767 (2013).
- 849 140. I. Steffan-Dewenter, U. Münzenberg, C. Bürger, C. Thies, T. Tschardt, Scale-
850 dependent effects of landscape context on three pollinator guilds. *Ecology.* **83**, 1421–
851 1432 (2002).
- 852 141. L. A. Garibaldi *et al.*, From research to action: enhancing crop yield through wild
853 pollinators. *Front. Ecol. Environ.* **12**, 439–447 (2014).

- 854 142. R. F. Pywell *et al.*, Effectiveness of new agri-environment schemes in providing
855 foraging resources for bumblebees in intensively farmed landscapes. *Biol. Conserv.*
856 **129**, 192–206 (2006).
- 857 143. R. F. Pywell *et al.*, Providing foraging resources for bumblebees in intensively farmed
858 landscapes. *Biol. Conserv.* **121**, 479–494 (2005).
- 859 144. C. Carvell, W. R. Meek, R. F. Pywell, D. Goulson, M. Nowakowski, Comparing the
860 efficacy of agri-environment schemes to enhance bumble bee abundance and diversity
861 on arable field margins. *J. Appl. Ecol.* **44**, 29–40 (2006).
- 862 145. M. Rundlöf, H. Nilsson, H. G. Smith, Interacting effects of farming practice and
863 landscape context on bumble bees. *Biol. Conserv.* **141**, 417–426 (2008).
- 864 146. C. M. Kennedy *et al.*, A global quantitative synthesis of local and landscape effects on
865 wild bee pollinators in agroecosystems. *Ecol. Lett.* **16**, 584–99 (2013).
- 866 147. S. D. Wratten, M. Gillespie, A. Decourtye, E. Mader, N. Desneux, Pollinator habitat
867 enhancement: Benefits to other ecosystem services. *Agric. Ecosyst. Environ.* **159**, 112–
868 122 (2012).
- 869 148. L. A. Morandin, M. L. Winston, V. A. Abbott, M. T. Franklin, Can pastureland
870 increase wild bee abundance in agriculturally intense areas? *Basic Appl. Ecol.* **8**, 117–
871 124 (2007).
- 872 149. B. R. Blaauw, R. Isaacs, Flower plantings increase wild bee abundance and the
873 pollination services provided to a pollination-dependent crop. *J. Appl. Ecol.* **51**, 890–
874 898 (2014).
- 875 150. D. Goulson, *Bumblebees: Behaviour, Ecology, and Conservation* (Oxford University
876 Press, Oxford, 2010).
- 877 151. L. M. Blackmore, D. Goulson, Evaluating the effectiveness of wildflower seed mixes
878 for boosting floral diversity and bumblebee and hoverfly abundance in urban areas.
879 *Insect Conserv. Divers.* **7**, 480–484 (2014).
- 880 152. M. Garbuzov, F. L. W. Ratnieks, Quantifying variation among garden plants in
881 attractiveness to bees and other flower-visiting insects. *Funct. Ecol.* **28**, 364–374
882 (2014).
- 883 153. I. Steffan-Dewenter, S. Schiele, Do resources or natural enemies drive bee population
884 dynamics in fragmented habitats? *Ecology.* **89**, 1375–1387 (2008).
- 885 154. C. D. Osteen, J. Fernandez-Cornejo, Economic and policy issues of U.S. agricultural
886 pesticide use trends. *Pest Manag. Sci.* **69**, 1001–1025 (2013).
- 887 155. S. Stevens, P. Jenkins, Heavy costs; weighing the value of neonicotinoid insecticides
888 in agriculture. *Cent. Food Saf. Rep.* (2014) [This report has no Doi, it is just available
889 online.](#)

- 890 156. B. Freier, E. F. Boller, *Integrated Pest Management in Europe - History, Policy,*
891 *Achievements and Implementation* In: R. Peshin & A.K. Dhawan, *Integrated Pest*
892 *management: Dissemination and Impact.* Springer, p 435-444. (2009).
- 893 Anon, *Directive 2009/128/Ec of the European Parliament and of the Council of 21 October*
894 *2009: establishing a framework for Community action to achieve the sustainable use of*
895 *pesticides (2009).*
- 896 157. EFSA, Conclusion on the peer review of the pesticide risk assessment for bees for the
897 active substance thiamethoxam. *EFSA J.* 2013. **11** (2013) (available at
898 <http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/efsajournal/pub/3067.htm>).
- 899 158. EFSA, Conclusion on the peer review of the pesticide risk assessment for bees for the
900 active substance clothianidin. *EFSA J.* 2013. **11** (2013) (available at
901 <http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/efsajournal/pub/3066.htm>).
- 902 159. EFSA, Conclusion on the peer review of the pesticide risk assessment for bees for the
903 active substance imidacloprid. *EFSA J.* 2013. **11** (2013) (available at
904 <http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/efsajournal/pub/3068.htm>).
- 905 160. M. S. Warren *et al.*, Rapid responses of British butterflies to opposing forces of
906 climate and habitat change. *Nature.* **414**, 65–69 (2001).
- 907 161. R. M. Pateman, J. K. Hill, D. B. Roy, R. Fox, C. D. Thomas, Temperature-dependent
908 alterations in host use drive rapid range expansion in a butterfly. *Science.* **336**, 1028–
909 30 (2012).
- 910 162. G. Lebuhn *et al.*, Detecting insect pollinator declines on regional and global scales.
911 *Conserv. Biol.* **27**, 113–20 (2013).
- 912 163. I. Fries, F. Feng, A. da Silva, S. B. Slemenda, N. J. Pieniazek, *Nosema ceranae* n. sp.
913 (Microspora, Nosematidae), morphological and molecular characterization of a
914 microsporidian parasite of the Asian honey bee *Apis cerana* (Hymenoptera, Apidae).
915 *Eur. J. Protistol.* **32**, 356–365 (1996).
- 916 164. M. Higes, R. Martín, A. Meana, *Nosema ceranae*, a new microsporidian parasite in
917 honeybees in Europe. *J. Invertebr. Pathol.* **92**, 93–5 (2006).
- 918 165. C. M. Aurori, D. S. Dezmirean, L. A. Mărghițaș, R. F. A. Moritz, *Nosema apis* and *N.*
919 *ceranae* in Western Honeybee (*Apis mellifera*) – Geographical Distribution and
920 Current Methods of Diagnosis. *Bull. UASVM Anim. Sci. Biotechnol.* **68**, 63–70 (2011).
- 921 166. J. Roberts, D. Anderson, Establishing the disease status of the Asian honeybee in the
922 Cairns region Rural Industries Research and Development Corporation. *RIRDC Publ.*
923 *No. 13/082, RIRDC Proj. No. PRJ-008433. Aust. Gov.* (2013).
- 924 167. J. Martínez, G. Leal, P. Conget, *Nosema ceranae* an emergent pathogen of *Apis*
925 *mellifera* in Chile. *Parasitol. Res.* **111**, 601–7 (2012).

- 926 168. Y. Chen *et al.*, Asymmetrical coexistence of *Nosema ceranae* and *Nosema apis* in
927 honey bees. *J. Invertebr. Pathol.* **101**, 204–9 (2009).
- 928 169. V. Chaimanee, N. Warrit, P. Chantawannakul, Infections of *Nosema ceranae* in four
929 different honeybee species. *J. Invertebr. Pathol.* **105**, 207–10 (2010).
- 930 170. C. Botías *et al.*, Further evidence of an oriental origin for *Nosema ceranae*
931 (Microsporidia: Nosematidae). *J. Invertebr. Pathol.* **110**, 108–13 (2012).

932 **Figures:**

933 **Figure 1. Some wild bee species have undergone major range contractions.** Shown here
934 for A the bumblebee *Bombus distinguendus* in the UK (data from the National Biodiversity
935 Network, UK, <https://data.nbn.org.uk/> and (B) *Bombus affinis* in North America (Map
936 produced by the Xerces Society, list of data providers can be found at:
937 <http://www.leifrichardson.org/bbna.html>). Photo credit: Dave Goulson, Johanna James-
938 Heinz.

939

940 **Figure 2. World distribution of the microsporidian pathogen *Nosema ceranae* in**
941 **different bee hosts.** This parasite was first isolated from the Eastern honeybee (*A. cerana*)
942 collected in China in 1996 (163), and was subsequently found infecting Western honey bees
943 (*A. mellifera*) in Europe in 2005 (164). Soon after *N. ceranae* was detected in *A. mellifera* in
944 many regions of the world including Africa, Asia, the Americas and Oceania (44, 45, 165–
945 168), and more recently in other bee species including several Asian *Apis* species (169, 170)
946 and wild bumblebees species from Europe, China and South America (41, 46, 47). *N.*
947 *ceranae* has also now been detected in solitary bees from Europe (48), confirming a very
948 wide range of hosts and high dispersal rate. Although the origins and primary host of *N.*
949 *ceranae* are yet to be accurately established, the apparent late and gradual invasions of *N.*
950 *ceranae* into different *A. mellifera* populations have led some authors to suggest that *A.*
951 *cerana* may be the primary host of *N. ceranae* and that it may have only recently emerged as
952 a parasite of Western bees (170). The mechanism by which *N. ceranae* broadened its host
953 range from an Asian bee species to other bee species across the world is unknown, but there
954 has been human-mediated contact between Asian and Western bees for at least a century. It
955 should be noted that regions in the figure where *Nosema* appears to be absent (white) may be
956 due to a lack of sampling in these areas.

957

958 **Figure 3. Both wild and managed bees are subject to a number of significant and**
959 **interacting stressors.** For example, exposure to some fungicides can greatly increase toxicity
960 of insecticides (*110–112*), whereas exposure to insecticides reduces resistance to diseases
961 (*115–123, 125, 126*). Dietary stresses are likely to reduce the ability of bees to cope with both
962 toxins and pathogens (*127–129*). Photo credit: Beth Nicholls; Flickr Commons, *AJCI*
963 (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/2.0/legalcode_)

964

965 **Figure 4. Increasing floral abundance in the landscape is very likely to benefit**
966 **pollinator populations.** A Schemes to boost flower abundance in farmland, such as this
967 wildflower strip along a field margin, have been demonstrated to provide clear benefits for
968 wild bee populations (e.g. *140–145*); B Urban areas can support high populations of
969 pollinators, which may spill over into neighboring farmland. Conversion of amenity
970 grasslands in urban areas to wildflower patches has been shown to greatly boost numbers of
971 wild pollinators (*151*).

972