

Agroforestry systems favor bat conservation but only when old and grazed

Manon Edo, Martin H Entling, Felix Herzog, Kira Noe, João HN Palma, Ayla Seithe, Will Simonson, Jo Smith, Anja Weiler, Verena Rösch



PII: S2351-9894(24)00573-0

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gecco.2024.e03369>

Reference: GECCO3369

To appear in: *Global Ecology and Conservation*

Received date: 25 November 2024

Accepted date: 15 December 2024

Please cite this article as: Manon Edo, Martin H Entling, Felix Herzog, Kira Noe, João HN Palma, Ayla Seithe, Will Simonson, Jo Smith, Anja Weiler and Verena Rösch, Agroforestry systems favor bat conservation but only when old and grazed, *Global Ecology and Conservation*, (2024)
doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gecco.2024.e03369>

This is a PDF file of an article that has undergone enhancements after acceptance, such as the addition of a cover page and metadata, and formatting for readability, but it is not yet the definitive version of record. This version will undergo additional copyediting, typesetting and review before it is published in its final form, but we are providing this version to give early visibility of the article. Please note that, during the production process, errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

© 2024 The Author(s). Published by Elsevier B.V.

Agroforestry systems favor bat conservation but only when old and grazed

Manon Edo*¹, Martin H Entling¹, Felix Herzog², Kira Noe¹, João HN Palma³, Ayla Seithe¹, Will Simonson⁴, Jo Smith³, Anja Weiler¹ & Verena Rösch¹

¹iES Landau, Institute for Environmental Sciences, RPTU Kaiserslautern Landau, Landau, Germany

²Agricultural Landscapes and Biodiversity, Agroscope, Zurich, Switzerland

³Moinhos de Vento Agroecology Research Centre, Mértola, Portugal

⁴Organic Research Centre, Trent Lodge, Stroud Road, Cirencester, Gloucestershire, GL7 6JN, UK

*Corresponding author:

E-mail address: manon.edo@rptu.de, ORCID: 0009-0008-2480-8465

E-mail addresses and ORCID of co-authors:

- martin.entling@rptu.de, ORCID: 0000-0002-3947-6407

- felix.herzog@agroscope.admin.ch ORCID: 0000-0001-9472-4891

- noe.kira@web.de, ORCID: 0009-0000-3845-2449

- aylaseithe@gmail.com, ORCID: 0009-0002-7779-1309

- joaopalma@mvarc.eu, ORCID: 0000-0002-1391-3437

- will.s@organicresearchcentre.com, ORCID: 0000-0001-5795-6802

- josmith@mvarc.eu, ORCID: 0000-0001-8761-8556

- anja.weiler@hotmail.de, ORCID: 0009-0003-6236-1434

- verena.roesch@rptu.de, ORCID: 0000-0002-0662-4338

KEYWORDS: agroforestry, acoustics, biodiversity, bat activity, Europe

WORD COUNT: 8397

ARTICLE IMPACT STATEMENT

Agroforestry systems with old broadleaf trees positively affect bats and deserve more attention in conservation planning.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We would like to thank our colleagues from the AGROMIX project (Mickael Bernard, María Blanco Gutiérrez, Samuele Ciacci, Lydie Dufour, Marco Gentili, Samuel Hepner, Gerardo Moreno, Alice Ripamonti, Robin Russias, Sophie Tournier and Lorenzo Gabriele Tramacere) who helped with data collection as well as the land owners for allowing us to sample their farms. Thanks to the AGROMIX colleagues Rachel Ramsey, Rodrigo Olave and Katharina Dehnen-Schmutz for the discussions about the study concept. Thanks to Victor Rolo Romero for his advices on statistics. A special thanks to Michel Barataud for sharing his expertise on bat identification and for his pre-review of the manuscript. The research was partly funded by the EU Horizon 2020 project AGROMIX (862993).

DECLARATION

Funding

This research was part of the AGROMIX Project and received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation program under grant agreement 862993.

Conflicts of interest

The authors have no relevant financial or non-financial interests to disclose.

The authors have no conflicts of interest to declare that are relevant to the content of this article.

Authors' contributions

ME, MHE, FH, JHNP, WS, JS and VR contributed to the study conception and design. ME, AW, JHNP, WS and JS collected the data. ME, VR, KN, AS and AW analyzed the data. ME led the writing, and ME, MHE, FH, JHNP, WS, JS and VR contributed to the finalization the manuscript. All authors read and approved the final version of the manuscript.


Availability of data and material

The datasets as well as the codes generated during and/or analyzed during the current study are available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.

ABSTRACT

As a consequence of agricultural intensification and landscape homogenization, semi-natural elements such as hedges, woodland patches and scattered trees have been removed from many agricultural areas. The resulting habitat loss has led to the decline in the diversity and abundance of many taxa including bats, which are highly dependent on woody plants for foraging, roosting and reproduction. By combining trees with crops (silvoarable systems) or livestock (silvopastoral systems), agroforestry re-integrates structural diversity into agricultural areas that could have beneficial effects on biodiversity. In this study, bat activity was recorded with autonomous sound recorders (AudioMoth) in sixty-five agroforestry and reference sites across western Europe. Bat activity in silvopastoral systems was two times higher than in pastures and orchards and four times higher than in cropland. In addition, social calls and foraging rates of bats were highest in silvopastoral systems. By contrast, bat activity was not higher in silvoarable systems compared to control plots. Tree characteristics affected total bat activity, which was higher with increased tree age and in sites with broad-leaved compared with coniferous trees. Our results show that the combination of old broad-leaved trees and livestock is highly beneficial for bats. Thus, silvopastoral systems deserve more attention in sustainable agriculture and biodiversity conservation. However, management should also be considered and especially the implementation of silvopastoral systems with low-intensity grazing and low pesticide input should be supported.

Graphical abstract



1) INTRODUCTION

Agricultural intensification has considerably modified European landscapes. Semi-natural habitats such as hedges and woodland patches as well as scattered trees have been removed, leading to a decrease in landscape diversity (Stoate et al. 2001; Robinson & Sutherland 2002). The resulting loss of shelters, roosting sites, foraging habitats and food resources has led to severe population declines in farmland biodiversity (e.g. Fahrig 2003) including insects (e.g. Raven & Wagner 2021), birds (Donald et al. 2001; Benton et al. 2002) and mammals (Pekin & Pijanowski 2012). Likewise, bat populations have been affected by land use changes and suffered drastic declines during the 20th century, in part due to reduced roost and prey availability (Micklenburgh et al. 2002; Park 2015; Treitler 2016). Across Europe, bat conservation is supported by several conventions (e.g. Bern and Bonn conventions (Council of Europe 1979, United Nations Environment Programme 1979)), agreements (e.g. EUROBATS Agreement (United Nations Environment Programme/Eurobats 1991)) and actions plans (e.g. Action Plan for the Conservation of Bat Species in the European Union (European Commission/Eurobats 2018)) and bats are legally protected in the European Union (Article 12 of the Habitat Directive, 92/43/CEE (European Union, 1992)). However, bat populations remain under pressure from anthropogenic threats, especially in agricultural areas where they face habitat change and roost disturbance (European Commission 2018; Frick et al. 2019). Their low reproduction rate, long lives and high metabolic requirements make bats sensitive to human activities and environmental change (Jones et al. 2009).

Bat sensitivity, combined with their presence in a wide range of ecosystems, make these mammals important bioindicators of wider biodiversity values (Jones, 2009). As insectivorous bats need a large quantity of insect prey to fulfil their energy requirements (Arthur & Lemaire 2015; Russo et al. 2021), their foraging activity closely correlates with insect availability. The activity of European bats was shown to increase in the presence of cattle and dung, which attract numerous insects (Downs & Sanderson 2010; Ancillotto et al. 2017). Moreover, previous studies have shown a positive effect of nearby forests, tree lines or isolated trees, hedgerows, tree groves (Boughey et al. 2011; Heim et al. 2015; Finch et al. 2020) on bat activity as well as on species richness. Especially old and broad-leaved trees are known to represent foraging and roosting habitats of higher value for bats compared to younger and coniferous tree stands, often associated to shorter rotation periods (Boye and Dietz 2005;

Russo et al. 2016; Charbonnier 2016). Dense networks of linear woody features within a landscape represent important landmarks for bats and are used both as commuting routes (e.g. between roosts and foraging areas) and for foraging (Verboom & Huitema 1997; Heim 2015).

By deliberately combining trees with crops (silvoarable systems) or livestock (silvopastoral systems) on the same land, agroforestry adds structural diversity to farmland (Nair 1993). The biophysical interactions between the woody and non-woody components support ecosystem services (Jose 2009; Mosquera-Losada et al. 2009; Palma et al., 2007) such as water retention (Joffre & Rambal, 1988) or nutrient cycling (Nair 2007; Torralba 2016) and can result in both economic and ecological advantages. The high heterogeneity due to the presence of trees and/or shrubs in agroforestry also benefits biodiversity by providing shelter, food, roosting and breeding opportunities for many organisms (Jose 2009; McAdam & McEvoy 2009; Torralba et al. 2016; Mupepele et al. 2021). Agroforestry has been shown to benefit arthropods (Boinot et al. 2019; Pardon et al. 2019), birds (Edo et al. 2024) and mammals (Klaa 2005; Gonçalves et al. 2012) all of which can promote ecosystem services such as pest control (Boinot et al. 2019; Staton et al. 2019). Although it has been demonstrated that agroforestry supports biodiversity and that bat activity is higher if linear elements and grazing animals are present in the landscape (Ancillotto et al. 2017), to our knowledge, no previous studies have specifically focused on bats in agroforestry systems at a European scale. Therefore, this study aims to elucidate the effects of agroforestry on bat richness and activity to inform and adapt conservation strategies for these European-wide protected mammals and in turn derive potential benefits to agriculture, since bats play a major role in the control of pest insects (Boyles et al. 2011; Kunz et al. 2011; Ancillotto et al. 2017). We predict that bat activity is higher in agroforestry systems, due to higher structural heterogeneity, compared with open agriculture (cropland and pastures) as well as compared with orchards. Given that grazing livestock attract numerous insects and that low-intensity grazing also contributes to habitat heterogeneity, we predict that grazing has a positive effect on bat activity. Overall, we predict bat activity to increase in grazed habitats (pastures and silvopastures) and in plots associated with woody elements (forests, agroforestry), as bats often depend on vegetation structures for both commuting and foraging. Hence, we predict more positive effects of silvopastoral than of silvoarable systems on bat activity. We predict that coniferous and broad-leaved trees will differently affect bat

activity and we expect an increase of bat activity with tree age as both increasing age and broad-leaved trees are known to represent roosting and foraging habitats of high value for bats.

2) MATERIAL AND METHODS

2.1) Study sites

The study was carried out in eight different geographical regions. In each region we selected an agroforestry farm (in the following referred as “site”) including either silvoarable agroforestry (combination of trees and crops) or silvopastoral agroforestry systems (combination of trees and livestock) and nearby control plots. The sites were located in seven countries across Europe: England, Switzerland, France (two sites) Germany, Italy, Portugal, and Spain (**Fig. 1**). We assessed bat diversity and activity in one to three agroforestry fields per site (hereafter termed as “plots”). In total we sampled seven silvoarable plots located in Southern France, Switzerland and England and thirteen silvopastoral plots located in Spain, Portugal, Italy, Central France and Germany. For each agroforestry plot, two to three control plots with the same woody or agricultural components were sampled. Thus, in addition to the silvoarable systems, a total of seven croplands (with the same crop as in the agroforestry system), ten forests and four orchards (with the same tree species as in the agroforestry system) were sampled. Similarly, 13 open pastures, 16 forests and five orchards were sampled as control plots for the silvopastoral systems. We defined the forests as areas with more than 10 percent tree cover over at least 0.5 ha and with part of the trees aged more than 30 years, but excluding trees of agricultural production systems (FAO, 2018). Fruit or nut orchards ($n = 9$) were sampled if the trees in the agroforestry system were fruit or nut trees (i.e. in Germany, Switzerland, in Southern France and in Portugal). Agroforestry and control plots of a same site were located nearby, to minimize the variation of e.g. climate, soil, and the surrounding landscape (coordinates of each plot are given in **Table A1**). The minimum distance between plots of the same site was 200 meters, to avoid any overlap of the bat call recordings. We selected mature agroforestry and orchard plots with trees planted at least 12 years ago. Hereafter, the time since planting will be referred to as “tree age”, irrespective of age of the trees at the time of planting which is not always known. The trees of the silvoarable plots in Switzerland (*Malus domestica*, *Prunus avium*), England (mixed broad-leaved tree stands) and Southern France (*Juglans regia*, *Pinus* spp.) were at least 12, 25 and 27 years old, respectively. The trees of the

silvopastoral plots were 20 (Germany, *Malus domestica*), 25 (Portugal, *Pinus* spp.), 35 (Central France, *Acer pseudoplatanus*, *Fraxinus excelsior* and *Prunus avium*), 90 (Italy, *Quercus* spp.) and 175 (Spain, *Quercus* spp.) years old. The control orchards and forests were stocked with trees of the same species and of approximatively the same age as those in the respective agroforestry site. Information on management, environmental parameters, tree species and crops associated to each plot as well as sampling dates can be found in **Table A1**.

2.2) Data collection

We assessed bat activity via analysis of the echolocation calls they use to detect prey and for orientation, and analysis of social calls. Autonomous sound recorders (AudioMoth V1.1.0, Open Acoustic Devices, firmware version 1.7., configuration app version 1.6.0; Hill et al. 2019) were mounted on a thin pole at a height of 1.5 m, with the microphone oriented towards the respective plot's centre. In each plot one AudioMoth was set up three times between March and July in 2021 (England, Germany, Switzerland and Central France) and 2022 (Southern France, Italy, Portugal and Spain). See **Supporting Table A1** for the detailed sampling dates. Recorders were placed at least 20 m from the plot's edge to record only individuals active within the studied habitat (Fuentes-Montemayor et al. 2013) and rotated between plots for each sampling to reduce possible hardware bias. AudioMoths were wrapped in a single layer of clingfilm to protect them from humidity and dust. We conducted surveys during calm and dry weather (i.e., wind force between 0 and 1 on the Beaufort scale and no precipitation), as bat activity is strongly reduced during wind or rain (Arthur & Lemaire 2015). During each of the three samplings, the AudioMoths were set to record continuously from ninety minutes before sunset until ninety minutes after sunrise. Full night recordings with continuous sampling allow the detection of more species and can account for varying activity of bats during the night (Skalak et al. 2012). Devices were programmed to record at medium gain, a recording duration of 3595 s and sleep duration of 5 s. The sampling rate of 192 kHz was suited to record all bat species of the study region except for *Rhinolophus euryale* and *R. hipposideros*. Recordings were saved as .wav files and stored on memory cards (SanDisk Corporation, Milpitas, California, USA). The same recordings, but different time windows were used to study birds in a previous study (Edo et al. 2024), which is the reason why the sampling took place in spring.

2.3) Species identification

The audio recordings from each site were split into one-minute files and pre-classified using the software Kaleidoscope Pro (version 5.4.8; Auto-ID: Bats of Europe classifier version 5.4.0 with European region database corresponding to each country; Wildlife Acoustics Inc., Concord, MA, USA). The software Kaleidoscope detects bat signals with a frequency range between 8 and 120 kHz, a pulse length in the range of 2 and 500 ms and a maximum of 500 ms inter-syllable gap. Files without any detected bat signals following these criteria were filtered out as “noise files” by the software and were not further analyzed. Files containing three (or fewer) bat calls recognized by the software as well as files misidentified by the software (e.g. vocalization of birds, orthoptera, anthropogenic noise) were manually assigned to “noise files”. Spectrogram parameters used were an FFT (Fast Fourier Transform) size of 512 and a Win size of 128 in an overlapping Hann window.

All one-minute files associated with a bat species or associated with the label “No-ID” were manually verified to avoid errors due to automatic identification (Russo & Voigt 2016; Rydell et al. 2017). Each bat pass (defined as three or more echolocation calls recognized by Kaleidoscope within one second of each other) was identified at species level for *Barbastella barbastellus*, *Hypsugo savii*, *Pipistrellus pipistrellus*, *Rhinolophus ferrumequinum* and *Tadarida teniotis*. Due to the similarities in call structures and frequencies and difficulties to distinguish between species especially in cluttered environments, we assigned several bat species to species groups/sonotypes: *Pipistrellus nathusii*/*P. kuhlii*, *Pipistrellus pygmaeus*/*Miniopterus schreibersii*, *Myotis* spp., *Plecotus* spp. and Nyctaloid sonotype (Schnitzler & Kalko 2001; Heim et al. 2015; Russo & Voigt 2016; Rydell et al. 2017). The Nyctaloid sonotype potentially included the species *Eptesicus isabellinus*, *E. nilssonii*, *E. serotinus*, *Nyctalus lasiopterus*, *N. leisleri*, *N. noctula* and *Vespertilio murinus*. *Myotis* spp. and *Plecotus* spp. potentially included all *Myotis* and *Plecotus* species from the study area. We identified the different bat species on the basis of their calls’ shape, regularity, recurrence, and signal structure as well as signal measurements such as maximum energy frequency, bandwidth, call duration, start and end frequency, maximum and minimum frequency, characteristic frequency, and inter-pulse interval (Barataud 2020; Russ 2021; Skiba 2009; Jamault 2018).

In addition to the total activity (total number of active minutes for each species), we counted feeding buzzes in the final approach towards prey before capture, as well as social calls, used for intra- and

inter-species communication (Russ 2021). A maximum of one individual per bat species, one feeding buzz and one social call was counted per one-minute file. We quantified bat activity during the sampling period by summing the total number of minutes containing bat passes (“active minutes”, further referred as “activity”) for each species/species group (Kalcounis et al. 1999; Froidevaux et al. 2017). In addition to the general activity, foraging activity was quantified by calculating the feeding buzz rate as the number of minutes with feeding buzzes per number of active minutes following equation (1):

$$\text{Feeding buzz rate}_i = \frac{n_{\text{feeding buzzes}_i}}{n_{\text{active minutes}_i} + 1} \quad (1)$$

Similarly, the social call rate was quantified as the number of minutes with social calls per number of active minutes following equation (2):

$$\text{Social call rate}_i = \frac{n_{\text{social calls}_i}}{n_{\text{active minutes}_i} + 1} \quad (2)$$

with $n_{\text{feeding buzzes}_i}$ (1) the number of minutes with feeding buzzes, $n_{\text{social calls}_i}$ (2) the number of minutes with social calls in each plot i , and $n_{\text{active minutes}_i}$ the total number of active minutes recorded in each plot across the three sampling dates.

2.4) Statistical analysis

In a first step, in order to analyze the effect of habitat type on bat activity, we fitted linear mixed-effect models with habitat type as explanatory variable (equation: $\text{lmer}(\text{Activity} \sim \text{Habitat} + (1|\text{Site}))$, R package `lme4`, Bates et al. 2015). Due to the nested design of the study, “Site” was used as a random factor. Post hoc tests were used to determine the pairwise differences of the total activity, social call rate and feeding buzz rate between habitats (R package `emmeans`, function `emmeans`, Lenth 2022). In a second step, we fitted linear mixed-effect models to analyze the effect of tree type (broadleaved or conifer) and tree age on bat activity, again with “Site” as a random factor (equation: $\text{lmer}(\text{Activity} \sim \log_{10}(\text{Age}) + \text{Tree type} + (1|\text{Site}))$). All models were tested against their respective null model to ensure that ΔAIC was >2 .

For all statistical tests, P-values < 0.05 were considered as significant. P-values, means and standard errors of the mean (SE) are given in text and tables. All statistical analyses were conducted in R version 4.2.2 (R Core Team 2022).

3) RESULTS

In total, 10 species and species groups (hereafter call types) were recorded (**Table 1**). The most common call types were *Pipistrellus pipistrellus* (present on 83% of all plots), *Pipistrellus nathusii*/*P. kuhlii* (78%) and *Myotis* (77%). Almost all call types were recorded in all habitats (**Table 1**).

Over all sites and across all species, 7890 active minutes were recorded, including 629 minutes with feeding buzzes and 749 minutes with social calls. Together, the *Pipistrellus* species represented 78% of the total activity recorded (**Table 1**). Bat activity was highest in silvopastoral plots and differed significantly from forests, cropland, pastures and marginally significantly from silvoarable and orchard plots (**Fig. 2**, **Table 1** and **Supporting Table A2**). Bat total activity was four times higher in silvopastoral plots relative to cropland, more than two times higher than in silvoarable plots, orchards and pastures and 1.5-times higher than in forests. *Pipistrellus nathusii*/*P. kuhlii* was the dominant sonotype in silvopastures, accounting for nearly half of total bat activity. Their activity was more than three times higher in silvopastures than in pastures and silvoarable systems, more than two times higher than in forests and more than six times higher than in orchards and cropland (**Table 1**). Similarly, *Rhinolophus ferrumequinum*, *Pipistrellus pipistrellus* and the species groups *Myotis*, *Pipistrellus pygmaeus*/*Miniopterus schreibersii* had their highest activity in silvopastoral systems compared to the other habitats, though differences were not significant. Nyctaloid activity was more balanced between habitat types. As an exception, *Tadarida teniotis* showed a higher activity in pastures compared to the other habitats (**Table 1**).

The feeding buzz rate was higher in silvopastures compared to pastures, but the difference was not significant (**Fig. 3a**, **Table 1**, **Supporting Table A3**). The social call rate was significantly higher in silvopastoral systems and forests relative to pastures (**Fig. 3b**, **Table 1** and **Supporting Table A3**).

Bat activity depended on tree type and was on average ten times higher in plots with broad-leaved trees (Spain, France-Lamartine, Italy, Germany, France-Restinclières, Switzerland and England) compared with coniferous trees (Portugal, France-Restinclières) (**Fig. 4**). In addition, bat activity

increased with tree age. The steepest increase in activity was found up to a tree age of around 50 years. A further increase in tree age led to a gradual saturation in activity (**Fig. 5**).

4) DISCUSSION

In line with our hypotheses, our results clearly underline the high value of silvopastoral agroforestry systems for bats. The presence of woody elements combined with livestock had a positive effect on bat activity. Bat activity was higher in silvopastoral systems than in all other habitats, both habitats with trees (silvoarable systems, forests, orchards) and without (cropland and pastures). In addition, feeding and social activity were higher in silvopastures compared with pastures. Broad-leaved trees were associated with a higher bat activity compared with coniferous trees and activity increased with increasing tree age. This suggests that across the studied European agroclimatic zones, silvopastoral systems with mature broad-leaved trees are of outstanding value for the foraging and socializing of bats. However, in our study, coniferous tree stands tended to be younger than broadleaved trees, as well as silvoarable systems being younger when compared to silvopastoral systems (**Supporting Table A1**). Consequently, the separation of the effects of tree type and tree age would require additional study of a larger set of agroforestry systems with more balanced age between conifers and broad-leaved trees, both in silvoarable and silvopastoral systems. The observed differences between habitat types are probably caused by differences in habitat structure and prey availability, which are in turn driven by the presence, age and type of trees, and by the cropping or grazing regime.

4.1) Effects of trees

The presence of trees has a strong influence on bats because woody structures represent important shelter and foraging habitats for them. Bat activity has thus been shown to increase near single trees (Fischer et al. 2010), tree lines and hedges (Wickramasinghe et al. 2003; Boughey 2011; Froidevaux et al. 2019). Linear woody landscape features serve as flight paths for bats, for example between their roosts and feeding habitats (Verboom & Huitema 1997; Heim 2015). Finch et al. (2020) and Toffoli et al. (2016) showed that bat activity was higher near linear woody features than in the middle of agricultural fields. In addition to increasing foraging efficiency by concentrating insect prey, linear vegetation elements facilitate the navigation of echolocating bats and offer them protection from wind

and from predators relying on vision (Verboom & Spoelstra 1999; Downs & Racey 2006; Froidevaux et al. 2019). Considering this, bats in silvopastoral systems may leave their roosts earlier than in treeless areas, which would enable them to forage for a longer time and consume more prey (Russo et al. 2007). The higher rates of feeding buzzes in silvopastoral systems relative to pastures further underlines the high value of silvopastoral systems as foraging habitat. During our recording season, bats use social calls to communicate with other individuals, for example as territorial or hunting area occupancy calls (Arthur & Lemaire 2015) or to indicate the location of the roost. Hence, the high rates of social calls in silvopastoral systems and forest underline their importance as foraging habitat. The high social call rates in silvopasture and forest may indicate additional functions for roosting, especially when compared to e.g. open pastures that had high bat activity but distinctly fewer social calls.

Our results show that, irrespective of habitat type, bat activity is highly influenced by tree age and tree species composition (Down & Racey 2006; Russo et al. 2016), which are both known to correlate with roosting opportunities. The steep increase in bat activity we measured up to a tree age of around 50 years suggests that the woody habitats with the highest ecological value for bats are those with mature trees. As trees age they develop more cavities and other roosting sites, not only for bats but also for their prey (Boye & Dietz 2005; Russo et al. 2016). Traditional silvopastoral agroforestry systems have long been known to support high biodiversity (e.g. Herzog et al. 1998, Moreno et al. 2016; Torralba et al. 2016) and Russo et al. (2005) already showed their importance for the bat species *Rhinolophus mehelyi* in the Dehesas region of Spain. Furthermore, older trees with their larger crowns may also provide more effective shelter from wind and predators (Down & Racey 2006). The higher bat activity measured in plots with broad-leaved trees compared with coniferous trees is in line with previous studies (Entwistle et al. 1996; Walsh & Harris 1996; Boye & Dietz 2005; Charbonnier 2016, Zahn et al. 2006) but in contrast with the study of Wegiel et al. (2023) who found no differences in bat activity between coniferous, deciduous and mixed tree stands. The often reduced attractiveness of coniferous tree stands for bats may be explained by a lower insect prey availability (Lepidoptera: Entwistle et al., 1996) as well as a lower availability of suitable roosting cavities for bats relative to broadleaved tree stands (Boye & Dietz 2005; Russo et al. 2016). The differences in bat activity we measured between coniferous and deciduous tree plantations could also have been influenced, beyond the tree species, by other characteristics as spatial structure, clutter condition, management or habitat fertility (Wegiel et

al., 2023). In our study, coniferous tree stands had slow growing trees (particularly in Portugal) due to the arid climate prevailing in the Mediterranean, which probably contributed to a low habitat quality of those trees for bats.

An important limitation with respect to our habitat comparison is that bat calls are transmitted further in open habitats than in densely cluttered environments (Hauptert et al., 2023; Sugai et al., 2020). This can lead to a declining sampling efficiency of acoustic recorders from open habitats over orchards/agroforestry to forest. This could affect our results with respect to bat activity. The reduced transmission in cluttered environments means that the true positive effects of agroforestry over open agriculture areas are likely higher than recorded in the current study, since sampling efficiency was likely reduced in agroforestry relative to open land. By contrast, the 1.5 times higher bat activity in silvopastures compared to forest may be an artefact of higher sampling efficiency in the more open silvopastures. Such limitations in the comparison of different habitat types can be overcome through the measurement of sound detection spaces (Darras et al., 2016), which would however be a major effort that was not feasible in the multiple sampling sites of the current study.

Another possible bias from our study design is the spatial proximity of forest, agroforestry and open agricultural plots. This likely means that open agricultural reference plots are closer to woody habitats than average open agricultural fields, and thus not fully representative. Since bat activity tends to decrease with distance from forest (e.g., Chavez et al. in press, Heim et al. 2015, Stahlschmidt et al. 2017), bat activity in open agriculture may be even more strongly suppressed than recorded in our study.

4.2) Effects of agricultural management

Our most interesting finding is probably the outstanding value of grazed agroforestry systems for bats, even when compared with forests. This may be explained by a higher food availability in silvopastoral systems due to the presence of livestock (Fuentes-Montemayor et al. 2013; Ancillotto et al. 2017, 2021). Many insects are associated with dung, including dipterans (Davies, 1957; Steelman 1976) and beetles (Merritt & Anderson 1977) that provide important food resources for bats (Downs & Sanderson 2010; Ancillotto et al. 2017, 2021) but also for other taxa including birds (Wilson et al. 1999). Interestingly, Ancillotto et al. (2017) and Downs & Sanderson (2010) found that bat foraging

activity was higher in the presence of cattle than in the presence of only dung, suggesting that flies (Diptera) attracted to the livestock themselves represent important additional prey for foraging bats. The higher activity recorded in silvopastoral plots was mostly the result of the presence of several *Pipistrellus* species, which are aerial hawkers feeding on flying insects foraging in relatively open areas (low tree densities and sparse understory cover). Other species, including *Myotis* spp., that forage in more cluttered environments, also showed a tendency to be more active in silvopastoral plots. *Rhinolophus ferrumequinum* is another example of a species that benefits from both a cluttered environment and the presence of livestock, feeding on dung-dwelling beetles (Jones 1990) preferably in forests and semi-open habitats. Previous studies have also shown an elevated activity of *Pipistrellus* spp. in grazed sites (Downs & Sanderson 2010; Fuentes et al. 2013; Costa et al. 2019; Ancillotto et al. 2017, 2021).

Differences in agricultural management may modulate the effects of agroforestry on bats. For example, high grazing intensity can reduce insect biomass (Jerrentrup et al. 2014), potentially lowering the food availability to bats. On the other hand, short swards may facilitate foraging for ground-gleaning species such as *Myotis myotis* (e.g. Zahn et al. 2006). Pesticide use can lead to food prey shortage and/or chemical exposure of bats, particularly in field crops and orchards, and turn such sites into “ecological sinks” (Stahlschmidt et al. 2017; Russo et al. 2024). In our study, all agroforestry and respective control plots were grazed at low intensity and managed according to the standards of organic farming (EEC regulation No. 834/2007). In conventional animal husbandry, the use of anthelmintics can have particularly negative effects on the dung-associated fauna (De Souza et al. 2022). Organic grazing systems were thus shown to sustain higher insect abundance and diversity, which in turn can exert a positive effect on bat activity (Wickramasinghe et al. 2003, 2004; Ancillotto et al. 2023).

The lower bat activity in forests compared with silvopastoral systems is surprising since forests are known to represent one of the most important roosting and feeding habitats for bats (Mickleburgh et al. 2002; Fuentes-Montemayor 2013; Heim et al. 2015; Russo et al. 2016; Frick et al. 2019). An explanation could be that apart from an increased prey availability, grazing with livestock helps to maintain an open understory and a lower tree density. This has been shown to benefit bats, as prey becomes more easily accessible, especially for ground-foraging bat species (Rainho et al. 2010) and aerial hawkers (e.g. *Pipistrellus* spp.) (Fuentes-Montamayor et al. 2013). Silvopastoral systems with

their high structural diversity may resemble landscapes that were formerly maintained by mega-herbivores now extinct in Western Europe, such as bison and wild horses (Galetti et al. 2017). Such semi-open, savanna-like landscapes provide very different conditions from today's production forests with their closed canopies and may thus explain the high bat occurrence in silvopastoral systems. Our results are in line with those found by Obrist et al. (2011) who measured a higher bat species richness as well as a higher bat activity in managed orchards (grazed, pruned or mowed) with a less dense vegetation compared to unmanaged ones. Whilst bats benefit from the presence of livestock, the relationship may be mutualistic. Bats are known to play a crucial role in consuming hematophagous insects and can thus help prevent the transmission of pathogens to livestock (Downs & Sanderson 2010; Ancillotto 2017; Palmer et al. 2019). Bats have also been shown to regulate herbivorous and fungal pests in forests and agroecosystems (Böhm et al. 2011; Maine & Boyles 2015; Charbonnier et al. 2021; Ancillotto et al. 2022; Maslo et al. 2022). Overall, bats support a wide range of ecosystem functions and services in agricultural areas, some of which may be economically significant (Boyles et al. 2011; Kunz et al. 2011; Maine & Boyles 2015).

5) CONCLUSION

In conclusion, silvopastoral systems are highly beneficial for bat conservation. This is particularly true for systems in which old broadleaf trees are combined with livestock. Silvopastoral agroforestry met the requirements of a wide range of different bat foraging and hunting guilds including open/edge foragers and forest species. Given the current rise of interest in the benefits of agroforestry for biodiversity conservation, it is important to note that the benefits were strongest in systems with mature trees of >50 years of age. This limits the conclusions that can be drawn on bat conservation from recently established agroforestry systems, and it indicates that systems with a short rotation of the tree component may be of limited conservation value. On the other hand, it emphasizes the importance of conservation of aged agroforestry stands. The results add to the growing evidence on the benefits of agroforestry systems to support farmland biodiversity and ecosystem service delivery through insectivory. Thus, agroforestry should be more widely adopted by farmers and supported with adequate policies. The role of agroforestry systems in supporting bat conservation may only be

effective if they are extensively managed, with a low pesticide input and the absence of human induced threats (e.g. wind turbines and roads) in the vicinity.

7) TABLES AND FIGURES




FIGURE 1 Geographic location of the silvoarable (A-C) and silvopastoral (D-H) study sites.

Triangles = silvoarable systems, circles = silvopastoral systems, A = Wakelyns (UK), B = Eulenhof and Sursee (CH), C = Restinclières (FR), D = Bannmühle (DE), E = Lamartine (FR), F = Tenuta di Paganico (IT), G = Dehesa de Majadas (ES), H = Moinhos de Vento (PO).




FIGURE 2 Bat total activity (number of active minutes) in agroforestry (silvoarable $n=7$, silvopastoral $n=13$), forest ($n=16$), orchards ($n=9$) and open agriculture (cropland $n=7$, pasture $n=13$). Significance levels: . $P < 0.1$, * $P < 0.05$. Grey dots indicate mean values. See Table 1 for the detailed results of activity (\pm SE) in each habitat. See Table S3 for the results of the mixed-effect models and post hoc tests used to determine the pairwise differences between habitats.




FIGURE 3 Feeding buzz rate (a) and social call rate (b) in agroforestry (silvoarable n=7, silvopastoral n=13), forest (n=16), orchards (n=9) and open agriculture (cropland n=7, pasture n=13). Significance levels: . $P < 0.1$, * $P < 0.05$. Grey dots indicate mean values. See Table 1 for the detailed results of activity (\pm SE) in each habitat. See Table S4 for the results of the mixed-effect models and post hoc tests used to determine the pairwise differences between habitats.




FIGURE 4 Comparison of bat total activity (number of active minutes) between plots with coniferous trees (silvoarable n=1, silvopastoral n=3, orchards n=4) and plots with broad-leaved trees (silvoarable n=6, silvopastoral n=10, forest n=16, orchards n=6). Significance levels: * $P < 0.05$. Grey dots indicate mean values.




FIGURE 5 Effect of tree age on bat total activity (number of active minutes) in agroforestry plots (silvoarable n=7, silvopastoral n=13), forests n=16 and orchards n=9. Predicted response (black line) and associated 95% confidence intervals (dashed lines).

TABLE 1 Bat activity \pm standard error of bat species/species groups recorded in silvoarable and silvopastoral plots, forests, orchards, cropland and pastures; letters show significant pairwise differences between habitats derived from post hoc tests

Species/Habitat	Silvoarable (n=7)	Silvopastoral (n=13)	Forest (n=16)	Orchard (n=9)	Cropland (n=7)	Pasture (n=13)	Total activity per species	Mean activity per species
<i>Barbastella barbastellus</i>	0 \pm 0	0.23 \pm 0.17	0.06 \pm 0.06	0 \pm 0	0 \pm 0	0.23 \pm 0.17	7	0.11 \pm 0.05
<i>Hypsugo savii</i>	0.29 \pm 0.29	0.92 \pm 0.37	1.06 \pm 0.60	0.89 \pm 0.77	1 \pm 0.43	1.92 \pm 1.36	71	1.09 \pm 0.33
<i>Pipistrellus pygmaeus/Miniopterus schreibersii</i>	11.71 \pm 10.73	42.77 \pm 26.39	25.5 \pm 8.64	8 \pm 7.26	7.29 \pm 5.98	5.69 \pm 2.58	1243	19.1 \pm 6.01
<i>Myotis spp.</i>	3 \pm 1.51	14.62 \pm 4.91	8.56 \pm 3.65	2.11 \pm 1.39	4.43 \pm 2.66	5.62 \pm 1.37	471	7.25 \pm 1.47
Nyctaloid	4.86 \pm 2.53	27.69 \pm 17.06	8.75 \pm 3.34	27.33 \pm 11.21	5.57 \pm 2.51	20.77 \pm 7.30	1089	16.2 \pm 4.15
<i>Pipistrellus nathusii/P. kuhlii</i>	14.57 \pm 7.77 ab	84.69 \pm 28.11 a	35.56 \pm 13.31 b	6.44 \pm 3.04 ab	13.29 \pm 7.59 ab	28.08 \pm 10.86 b	2288	35.2 \pm 7.53

<i>Pipistrellus pipistrellus</i>	29.29 ± 7.69	44.54 ± 17.22	51.88 ± 13.77	33.56 ± 14.17	20.29 ± 3.92	15.31 ± 5.63	2257	34.7 ± 5.53
<i>Plecotus</i> spp.	1.14 ± 0.63	1.46 ± 0.91	1.44 ± 0.48	0.22 ± 0.15	1.71 ± 0.89	2.92 ± 1.55	102	1.57 ± 0.40
<i>Rhinolophus ferrumequinum</i>	0 ± 0	0.77 ± 0.54	0.5 ± 0.18	0 ± 0	0.14 ± 0.14	0.15 ± 0.11	21	0.32 ± 0.12
<i>Tadarida teniotis</i>	0.43 ± 0.43 ab	2.54 ± 1.40 ab	1.31 ± 0.49 b	0.78 ± 0.55 ab	0.86 ± 0.70 ab	20.85 ± 12.19 a	341	5.25 ± 20.7 5
Total activity^b	65.29 ± 27.49 b	220.23 ± 52.23 a	134.62 ± 22.45 b	79.33 ± 24.79 ab	54.57 ± 18.89 b	101.54 ± 23.3 b	-	-
Feeding buzzes	6.29 ± 2.29 ab	23.46 ± 6.86 a	11.5 ± 3.24 ab	4 ± 1.57 b	4 ± 1.93 b	2.46 ± 0.83 b	629	9.68 ± 1.86
Feeding buzzes rate	0.08 ± 0.03 ab	0.15 ± 0.07 a	0.07 ± 0.01 ab	0.03 ± 0.01 ab	0.06 ± 0.03 ab	0.02 ± 0.01 b	-	0.07 ± 0.02
Social calls	2 ± 1.31 ab	32.23 ± 12.35 a	16.19 ± 5.22 ab	3.33 ± 2.49 ab	1.71 ± 1.25 ab	0.92 ± 0.38 b	746	11.4 ± 3.11
Social calls rate	0.01 ± 0.01 ab	0.11 ± 0.03 a	0.11 ± 0.03 a	0.02 ± 0.0 1 ab	0.03 ± 0.02 ab	0.01 ± 0.00 b	-	0.06 ± 0.01

^b number of active minutes; feeding buzzes and social calls excluded

8) SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Habitat characteristics and sampling dates of all studied plots (**Appendix A1**), results of post-hoc pairwise comparison showing and total bat activity differences (**Appendix A2**), feeding buzz and social call rate differences (**Appendix A3**) as well as the activity of different bat species in each sampled plot (raw data) (**Appendix A4**) are available as supporting information in the online version of the article at the publisher's website. The authors are solely responsible for the content and functionality of these materials. Queries (other than absence of the material) should be directed to the corresponding author.

7) REFERENCES

- Ancillotto L, Ariano A, Nardone V, Budinski I, Rydell J, Russo D. 2017. Effects of free-ranging cattle and landscape complexity on bat foraging: Implications for bat conservation and livestock management. *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment* **241**:54–61. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2017.03.001>
- Ancillotto L, Festa F, De Benedetta F, Cosentino F, Pejic B, Russo D. 2021. Free-ranging livestock and a diverse landscape structure increase bat foraging in mountainous landscapes. *Agroforest Systems* **95**:407–418. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10457-021-00591-0>
- Ancillotto L, Rummo R, Agostinetto G, Tommasi N, Garonna AP, De Benedetta F, Bernardo U, Galimberti A, Russo D. 2022. Bats as suppressors of agroforestry pests in beech forests. *Forest Ecology and Management* **522**:120467. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2022.120467>
- Ancillotto L, Scaramella C, Dartora F, Migliozi A, Russo D. 2023. Organic farming sustains bats in Mediterranean farmland. *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment* **342**:108230. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2022.108230>
- Arthur L, Lemaire M. 2015. *Les Chauves-souris de France, Belgique, Luxembourg et Suisse*. Deuxième édition. Muséum national d'Histoire naturelle, Paris. Biotope, Mèze.
- Barataud, M. 2020. *Acoustic ecology of European bats. Species identification, Study of their habitats and foraging behaviour*. 2nd ed. Biotope, Mèze ; Muséum national d'histoire naturelle, Paris (collection Inventaires et biodiversité), 368 p.
- Bates D, Maechler M, Bolker B, Walker S. 2015. Fitting linear mixed-effects models using lme4. *Journal of Statistical Software* **67**: 1–48. <https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v067.i01>
- Benton TG, Bryant DM, Cole L, Crick HQP. 2002. Linking agricultural practice to insect and bird populations: a historical study over three decades: Farming, insect and bird populations. *Journal of Applied Ecology* **39**:673–687. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2664.2002.00745.x>
- Böhm SM, Wells K, Kalko EKV. 2011. Top-down control of herbivory by birds and bats in the canopy of temperate broad-leaved oaks (*Quercus robur*). *PLoS ONE* **6**:e17857 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0017857>
- Boinot S, Poulmarc'h J, Mézière D, Lauri P-É, Sarthou J-P. 2019. Distribution of overwintering

- invertebrates in temperate agroforestry systems: Implications for biodiversity conservation and biological control of crop pests. *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment* **285**:106630. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2019.106630>
- Boughey KL, Lake IR, Haysom KA, Dolman PM. 2011. Improving the biodiversity benefits of hedgerows: How physical characteristics and the proximity of foraging habitat affect the use of linear features by bats. *Biological Conservation* **144**:1790–1798. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2011.02.017>
- Boye P, Dietz M. 2005. Development of good practice guidelines for woodland management for bats. Research Report. English Nature.
- Boyles JG, Cryan PM, McCracken GF, Kunz TH. 2011. Economic Importance of Bats in Agriculture. *Science* **332**:41–42. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1201366>
- Charbonnier Y. 2016. Relations entre diversité des habitats forestiers et communautés de chiroptères à différentes échelles spatiales en Europe : implications pour leur conservation et le maintien de leur fonction de prédation. Doctoral Dissertation, Bordeaux.
- Charbonnier Y, Gaüzère P, Van Halder I, Nezan J, Barnagaud J-Y, Jactel H, Barbaro L. 2016. Deciduous trees increase bat diversity at stand and landscape scales in mosaic pine plantations. *Landscape Ecology* **31**:291–300. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10980-015-0242-0>
- Charbonnier Y, Papura D, Touzot O, Rhoyou N, Sentenac G, Rusch A. 2021. Pest control services provided by bats in vineyard landscapes. *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment* **306**:107207. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2020.107207>
- Chavez F, Entling MH, Alcalá Herrera R, Benitez E, Möth S, Reiff JM, Winter S, Rösch V. Strong benefit of hedgerows to bats in three European winegrowing regions. *Ecosphere*. In press
- Cole LJ, McCracken DI, Dennis P, Downie IS, Griffin AL, Foster GN, Murphy KJ, Waterhouse T. 2002. Relationships between agricultural management and ecological groups of ground beetles (Coleoptera: Carabidae) on Scottish farmland. *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment* **93**:323–336. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0167-8809\(01\)00333-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0167-8809(01)00333-4)
- Council of Europe, 1979. Convention on the Conservation of European Wildlife and Natural Heritage. 19 September 1979. Bern, Switzerland.
- Costa P, Medinas D, Silva BM, Mira A, Guiomar N, Sales-Baptista E, Ferraz-de-Oliveira MI,

- Simões MP, Belo ADF, Herrera JM. 2019. Cattle-driven forest disturbances impact ensemble composition and activity levels of insectivorous bats in Mediterranean wood pastures. *Agroforest Systems* **93**:1687–1699. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10457-018-0275-x>
- Darras K, Pütz P, Rembold K, Tschardt T. 2016. Measuring sound detection spaces for acoustic animal sampling and monitoring. *Biological Conservation* **201**: 29–37. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2016.06.021>
- Davies L. 1957. A Study of the blackfly, *Simulium ornatum* Mg. (Diptera), with particular reference to its activity on grazing cattle. *Bulletin of entomological Research* **48**:407–424.
- De Souza RB, Guimarães JR. 2022. Effects of avermectins on the environment based on its toxicity to plants and soil invertebrates—A review. *Water, Air, & Soil Pollution* **233**.7:259. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11270-022-05744-0>
- Donald PF, Green RE, Heath MF. 2001. Agricultural intensification and the collapse of Europe's farmland bird populations. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series B: Biological Sciences* **268**:25–29. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2000.1325>
- Downs NC, Racey PA. 2006. The use by bats of habitat features in mixed farmland in Scotland. *Acta Chiropterologica* **8**:169–185. <https://doi.org/10.3161/150811006777070893>
- Downs NC, Sanderson LJ. 2010. Do Bats Forage Over Cattle Dung or Over Cattle? *Acta Chiropterologica* **12**:349–358. <https://doi.org/10.3161/150811010X537936>
- Edo M, Entling MH, Rösch V. 2024. Agroforestry supports high bird diversity in European farmland. *Agronomy for Sustainable Development* **44**.1: 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13593-023-00936-2>
- Entwistle AC, Racey PA, Speakman JR. 1996. Habitat exploitation by a gleaner bat, *Plecotus auritus*. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London. Series B: Biological Sciences* **351**.1342:921–931.
- European Commission/Eurobats. 2018. Action Plan for the Conservation of All Bat Species in the European Union 2018–2024.
- European Union, 1992. Council Directive 92/43/EEC of 21 May 1992 on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora. *Official Journal of the European Union* L206. 22.07.1992. 7–50.

- Fahrig L. 2003. Effects of Habitat Fragmentation on Biodiversity. *Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics* **34**:487–515.
<https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.ecolsys.34.011802.132419>
- FAO (Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations). 2018. Global Forest Resources Assessment 2020, Working Paper 188, Terms and Definitions.
<https://www.fao.org/3/I8661EN/i8661en.pdf>.
- Finch D, Schofield H, Mathews F. 2020. Habitat Associations of Bats in an Agricultural Landscape: Linear Features Versus Open Habitats. *Animals* **10**:1856.
<https://doi.org/10.3390/ani10101856>
- Fischer J, Stott J, Law BS. 2010. The disproportionate value of scattered trees. *Biological Conservation* **143**:1564–1567. doi: 10.1016/j.biocon.2010.03.030
- Frick WF, Kingston T, Flanders J. 2019. A review of the major threats and challenges to global bat conservation. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences* **1469**:5–25.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/nyas.14045>
- Froidevaux JSP, Louboutin B, Jones G. 2017. Does organic farming enhance biodiversity in Mediterranean vineyards? A case study with bats and arachnids. *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment* **249**:112–122. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2017.08.012>
- Froidevaux JSP, Boughey KL, Hawkins CL, Broyles M, Jones G. 2019. Managing hedgerows for nocturnal wildlife: Do bats and their insect prey benefit from targeted agri-environment schemes? *Journal of Applied Ecology* **56**:1610–1623. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2664.13412>
- Fuentes-Montemayor E, Goulson D, Cavin L, Wallace JM, Park KJ. 2013. Fragmented woodlands in agricultural landscapes: The influence of woodland character and landscape context on bats and their insect prey. *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment* **172**:6–15.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2013.03.019>
- Galetti M et al. 2018. Ecological and evolutionary legacy of megafauna extinctions. *Biological Reviews* **93**:845–862. <https://doi.org/10.1111/brv.12374>.
- Gonçalves P, Alcobia S, Simões L, Santos-Reis M. 2012. Effects of management options on

- mammal richness in a Mediterranean agro-silvo-pastoral system. *Agroforestry Systems* **85**:383–395. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10457-011-9439-7>
- Hauptert S, Sèbe F, Sueur J. 2023. Physics-based model to predict the acoustic detection distance of terrestrial autonomous recording units over the diel cycle and across seasons: Insights from an Alpine and a Neotropical forest. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution* **14**(2):614–630. <https://doi.org/10.1111/2041-210X.14020>
- Heim O, Treitler JT, Tschapka M, Knörnschild M, Jung K. 2015. The Importance of Landscape Elements for Bat Activity and Species Richness in Agricultural Areas. *PLOS ONE* **10**:e0134443. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0134443>
- Herzog F. 1998. Streuobst: a traditional agroforestry system as a model for agroforestry development in temperate Europe. *Agroforestry Systems* **42**:61 - 80. <https://doi.org/10.1023/a:1006152127824>
- Hill AP, Prince P, Snaddon JL, Doncaster CP, Rogers A. 2019. AudioMoth: A low-cost acoustic device for monitoring biodiversity and the environment. *HardwareX* **6**: e00073. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ohx.2019.e00073>
- Jamault R, Godeau JF, Barataud M. 2018. Website GraphB (v1.8) http://geoeco.fr/ecologie_acoustique/appli_graph
- Jerrentrup JS, Wrage-Mönnig N, Röver KU, Isselstein J. 2014. Grazing intensity affects insect diversity via sward structure and heterogeneity in a long-term experiment. *Journal of Applied Ecology* **51**(4):968-977. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2664.12244>
- Joffre R, Rambal S. 1988. Soil water improvement by trees in the rangelands of southern Spain. *Acta Oecologia - Oecologia Plantarum* **9.4**:405-422.
- Jones G, Jacobs D, Kunz T, Willig M, Racey P. 2009. Carpe noctem: the importance of bats as bioindicators. *Endangered Species Research* **8**:93–115. <https://doi.org/10.3354/esr00182>
- Jones G. 1990. Prey selection by the Greater Horseshoe Bat (*Rhinolophus ferrumequinum*): optimal foraging by echolocation? *Journal of Animal Ecology* **59**:587–602. <https://doi.org/10.2307/4882>
- Jose S. 2009. Agroforestry for ecosystem services and environmental benefits: an overview. *Agroforestry Systems* **76**:1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10457-009-9229-7>

- Klaa K, Mill PJ, Incoll LD. 2005. Distribution of small mammals in a silvoarable agroforestry system in Northern England. *Agroforestry Systems* **63**:101–110.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10457-004-1110-0>
- Kunz TH, Braun De Torrez E, Bauer D, Lobova T, Fleming TH. 2011. Ecosystem services provided by bats. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences* **1223**:1–38.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1749-6632.2011.06004.x>
- Lenth R. 2022. Emmeans: Estimated Marginal Means, aka Least-Squares Means. R package version 1.8.2. <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=emmeans>
- McAdam JH, McEvoy PM. 2009. The potential for silvopastoralism to enhance biodiversity on grassland farms in Ireland. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4020-8272-6_17 In: Rigueiro-Rodríguez A, McAdam J, Mosquera-Losada MR (Eds.). *Agroforestry in Europe, Advances in Agroforestry*. Pages 343-356. Springer Netherlands, Dordrecht. ISBN:9781402082719
- Maine JJ, Boyles JG. 2015. Bats initiate vital agroecological interactions in corn. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **112**:12438–12443. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1505413112>
- Maslo B, Mau RL, Kerwin K, McDonough R, McHale E, Foster JT. 2022. Bats provide a critical ecosystem service by consuming a large diversity of agricultural pest insects. *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment* **324**:107722.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2021.107722>
- Merritt RW, Anderson JR. 1977. The effects of different pasture and rangeland ecosystems on the annual dynamics of insects in cattle droppings. University of California Division of Agricultural Sciences.
- Mickleburgh SP, Hutson AM, Racey PA. 2002. A review of the global conservation status of bats. *Oryx* **36**:18–34. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0030605302000054>
- Moreno G, Gonzalez-Bornay G, Pulido F, Lopez-Diaz ML, Bertomeu M, Juárez E, Diaz M. 2016. Exploring the causes of high biodiversity of Iberian dehesas: the importance of wood pastures and marginal habitats. *Agroforest Syst* **90**:87–105. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10457-015-9817-7>
- Mosquera-Losada MR, McAdam JH, Romero-Franco R, Santiago-Freijanes JJ, Rigueiro-

- Rodríguez A. 2009. Definitions and Components of Agroforestry Practices in Europe. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4020-8272-6_1 In: Rigueiro-Rodríguez A, McAdam J, Mosquera-Losada MR (Eds.). *Agroforestry in Europe, Advances in Agroforestry*. Pages 3–19. Springer Netherlands, Dordrecht. ISBN:9781402082719
- Mupepele A-C, Keller M, Dormann CF. 2021. European agroforestry has no unequivocal effect on biodiversity: a time-cumulative meta-analysis. *BMC Ecology and Evolution* **21**:193. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12862-021-01911-9>
- Nair PR. 2007. The coming of age of agroforestry. *Journal of the Science of Food and Agriculture* **87**:1613–1619. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jsfa.2897>
- Nair PR. 1993. *An introduction to agroforestry*. Springer Science & Business Media. ISBN:9780792321354
- Obrist MK, Rathey E, Bontadina F, Martinoli A, Conedera M, Christe P, Moretti M. 2011. Response of bat species to sylvo-pastoral abandonment. *Forest Ecology and Management* **261(3)**:789-798.
- Palma JHN et al. 2007. Modeling environmental benefits of silvoarable agroforestry in Europe. *Agriculture, ecosystems & environment* **119(3-4)**:320-334. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2006.07.021>
- Palmer MS, Krueger J, Forest I. 2019. Bats join the ranks of oxpeckers and cleaner fish as partners in a pest-reducing mutualism. *Ethology* **125.3**:170-175. <https://doi.org/10.1111/eth.12840>
- Pardon P, Reheul D, Mertens J, Reubens B, De Frenne P, De Smedt P, Proesmans W, Van Vooren L, Verheyen K. 2019. Gradients in abundance and diversity of ground dwelling arthropods as a function of distance to tree rows in temperate arable agroforestry systems. *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment* **270–271**:114–128. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2018.10.017>
- Park KJ. 2015. Mitigating the impacts of agriculture on biodiversity: bats and their potential role as bioindicators. *Mammalian Biology* **80**:191–204. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mambio.2014.10.004>
- Pekin BK, Pijanowski BC. 2012. Global land use intensity and the endangerment status of mammal

- species. *Diversity and Distributions* **18.9**:909–918. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1472-4642.2012.00928.x>
- R Core Team. 2022. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. <https://www.R-project.org/>
- Rainho A, Augusto AM, Palmeirim JM. 2010. Influence of vegetation clutter on the capacity of ground foraging bats to capture prey. *Journal of Applied Ecology* **47**:850–858. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2664.2010.01820.x>
- Raven PH, Wagner DL. 2021. Agricultural intensification and climate change are rapidly decreasing insect biodiversity. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **118.2**:e2002548117. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2002548117>
- Robinson RA, Sutherland WJ. 2002. Post-war changes in arable farming and biodiversity in Great Britain. *Journal of Applied Ecology* **39.1**:157–176. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2664.2002.00695.x>
- Russ J. 2021. *Bat Calls of Britain and Europe: A Guide to Species Identification*. 1st edition. Exeter: Pelagic Publishing Ltd.
- Russo D, Almenar D, Aihartza J, Goiti U, Salsamendi E, Garin I. 2005. Habitat selection in sympatric *Rhinolophus mehelyi* and *R. euryale* (Mammalia: Chiroptera). *Journal of Zoology*, **266(3)**:327–332. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0952836905006990>
- Russo D et al. 2016. Identifying Key Research Objectives to Make European Forests Greener for Bats. *Frontiers in Ecology and Evolution* **4**:87 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fevo.2016.00087>
- Russo D, Cistrone L, Jones G. 2007. Emergence time in forest bats: the influence of canopy closure. *Acta Oecologica* **31**:119–126. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actao.2006.11.001>
- Russo D, Tanalgo K, Rebelo H, Cistrone L. 2024. To improve or not to improve? The dilemma of "bat-friendly" farmland potentially becoming an ecological trap. *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment* **375**, p.109215. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2024.109215>
- Russo D, Voigt CC. 2016. The use of automated identification of bat echolocation calls in acoustic monitoring: A cautionary note for a sound analysis. *Ecological Indicators* **66**:598–602. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2016.02.036>
- Rydell J, Nyman S, Eklöf J, Jones G, Russo D. 2017. Testing the performances of automated

- identification of bat echolocation calls: A request for prudence. *Ecological Indicators* **78**:416–420. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2017.03.023>
- Schnitzler H-U, Kalko EKV. 2001. Echolocation by Insect-Eating Bats. *BioScience* **51**:557. [https://doi.org/10.1641/0006-3568\(2001\)051\[0557:EBIEB\]2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1641/0006-3568(2001)051[0557:EBIEB]2.0.CO;2)
- Skalak SL, Sherwin RE, Brigham RM. 2012. Sampling period, size and duration influence measures of bat species richness from acoustic surveys. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution* **3**:490–502. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2041-210X.2011.00177.x>
- Skiba, R. 2009. Europäische Fledermäuse. Kennzeichen, Echoortung und Detektoranwendung. 2., aktualisierte und erweiterte Auflage. Hohenwarsleben: Westarp (Die neue Brehm-Bücherei, 648).
- Stahlschmidt P, Hahn M, Brühl CA. 2017. Nocturnal risks-high bat activity in the agricultural landscape indicates potential pesticide exposure. *Frontiers in Environmental Science* **5**:62. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fenvs.2017.00062>
- Staton T, Walters RJ, Smith J, Girling RD. 2019. Evaluating the effects of integrating trees into temperate arable systems on pest control and pollination. *Agricultural Systems* **176**:102676. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agsy.2019.102676>
- Steelman CD. 1976. Effects of external and internal arthropod parasites on domestic livestock production. *Annual Review of Entomology* **21**:155–178.
- Stoate C, Boatman ND, Borralho RJ, Carvalho CR, Snoo GR, de Eden P. 2001. Ecological impacts of arable intensification in Europe. *Journal of Environmental Management* **63**:337–365. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jema.2001.0473>
- Sugai LSM, Desjonqueres C, Silva TS, Llusia D. 2020. A roadmap for survey designs in terrestrial acoustic monitoring. *Remote Sensing in Ecology and Conservation* **6(3)**:220–235. <https://doi.org/10.1002/rse2.131>
- Toffoli R. 2016. The Importance of Linear Landscape Elements for Bats in a Farmland Area: The Influence of Height on Activity. *Journal of Landscape Ecology* **9**:49–62. <https://doi.org/10.1515/jlecol-2016-0004>
- Torralba M, Fagerholm N, Burgess PJ, Moreno G, Plieninger T. 2016. Do European

- agroforestry systems enhance biodiversity and ecosystem services? A meta-analysis. *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment* **230**:150–161.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2016.06.002>
- Treitler JT, Heim O, Tschapka M, Jung K. 2016. The effect of local land use and loss of forests on bats and nocturnal insects. *Ecology and Evolution* **6.13**:4289–4297.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/ece3.2160>
- United Nations Environment Programme. 1979. Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals. 4 November 1979. Bonn, Germany. Retrieved 18 August 2023.
- United Nations Environment Programme/Eurobats. 1991. Agreement on the Conservation of Bats in Europe. Eurobats. 4 December 1991. Retrieved 7 August 2019. www.eurobats.org
- Verboom B, Huitema H. 1997. The importance of linear landscape elements for the pipistrelle *Pipistrellus pipistrellus* and the serotine bat *Eptesicus serotinus*. *Landscape ecology* **12**:117–125.
- Verboom B, Spoelstra K. 1999. Effects of food abundance and wind on the use of tree lines by an insectivorous bat, *Pipistrellus pipistrellus*. *Canadian Journal of Zoology* **77**:1393–1401.
- Walsh AL, Harris S. 1996. Foraging Habitat Preferences of Vespertilionid Bats in Britain. *The Journal of Applied Ecology* **33**:508. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2404980>
- Węgiel A, Grzywiński W, Jaros R, Łacka A, Węgiel J. 2023. Comparison of the Foraging Activity of Bats in Coniferous, Mixed, and Deciduous Managed Forests. *Forests* **14(3)**:481.
<https://doi.org/10.3390/f14030481>
- Wickramasinghe LP, Harris S, Jones G, Vaughan Jennings N. 2004. Abundance and Species Richness of Nocturnal Insects on Organic and Conventional Farms: Effects of Agricultural Intensification on Bat Foraging. *Conservation Biology* **18**:1283–1292.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1523-1739.2004.00152.x>
- Wickramasinghe LP, Harris S, Jones G, Vaughan N. 2003. Bat activity and species richness on organic and conventional farms: impact of agricultural intensification. *Journal of Applied Ecology* **40**:984–993. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2664.2003.00856.x>
- Wilson JD, Morris AJ, Arroyo BE, Clark SC, Bradbury RB. 1999. A review of the abundance

and diversity of invertebrate and plant foods of granivorous birds in northern Europe in relation to agricultural change. *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment* **75**:13–30.

Zahn A, Rottenwallner A, Güttinger R. 2006. Population density of the greater mouse-eared bat (*Myotis myotis*), local diet composition and availability of foraging habitats. *Journal of Zoology* **269**(4):486-493. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-7998.2006.00081.x>

Declaration of Competing Interest

We confirm having no conflicts of interests with them as well as no previous co-authored publications.

- The work as submitted has not been published or accepted for publication, nor is being considered for publication elsewhere, either in whole or substantial part.
- All authors and relevant institutions have read the submitted version of the manuscript and approve its submission.
- All persons entitled to authorship have been so included.
- The work is original and all necessary acknowledgements have been made.
- The work conforms to the legal requirements of the country in which it was carried out, including those relating to conservation and welfare, and to the journal's policy on these matters.
- Third party data sets used in this work are either publicly available for unrestricted reuse or permission for reuse has been obtained from the data owners

HIGHLIGHTS

- We recorded bat activity and foraging in 65 agroforestry and reference locations across 7 countries
- Bat activity and foraging success was highest in grazed but not arable agroforestry systems
- Tree age contributed strongly to the habitat value for bats
- Silvopastoral systems deserve more attention for biodiversity conservation in farmland