

Tree diversity regulates forest pest invasion

Qinfeng Guo¹, Songlin Fei², Kevin Potter³, Andrew Liebhold⁴, Jun Wen⁵

¹USDA, ²Purdue University, ³North Carolina State University, ⁴USDA Forest Service, ⁵Duke University

Submitted to Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America

Nonnative pests often cause cascading ecological impacts, leading to detrimental socio-economic consequences. However, it is still unclear how plant diversity may influence insect and disease invasions. High species diversity in host communities may promote pest invasions by providing more niches (i.e., facilitation), but can also diminish invasion success because low host dominance may make it more difficult for pests to establish (i.e., dilution). Most studies to date have focused on small-scale, experimental, or individual pest/disease species, while large-scale empirical studies, especially in natural ecosystems, are extremely rare. Using subcontinental-level data, we examined the role of tree diversity on pest invasion across the conterminous USA. We find that the tree-pest diversity relationships are hump-shaped. Pest diversity increases with tree diversity at low tree diversity (because of facilitation or amplification), and is reduced at higher tree diversity (the result of dilution). Thus, tree diversity likely regulates forest pest invasion through both facilitation and dilution that operate simultaneously, but their relative strengths vary with overall diversity. Our findings suggest the role of native species diversity in regulating nonnative pest invasions.

biotic resistance | constraint envelope | Facilitation | Dilution | host vs. nonhost

Biological invasions often lead to novel, and sometimes complex, species interactions within and among trophic levels (1-3). These novel cross-trophic interactions can have serious socio-economic consequences, such as the emergence of new human diseases and outbreaks of agricultural and forest pests (4, 5). To date, many studies have separately examined how host species diversity may promote or diminish parasite/disease diversity (6, 7). While small-scale and experimental research (especially on a single parasite) has provided empirical and theoretical evidence of facilitation, dilution, or both (8), corresponding patterns in natural ecosystems are largely unknown, especially over regional or continental scales. More importantly, the role of overall community diversity (i.e., hosts plus non-hosts in the entire assemblages) in multi-pest invasion remains elusive (9-12).

The relationship between tree diversity and susceptibility to pest invasions is central to invasion biology and has implications in ecosystem management (13). Theory predicts that high diversity is generally associated with lower average abundance for each component species (14). When considering cross-trophic aspects of the invasion processes (e.g., host-parasite, plant-pest), facilitation assumes that more host species provide more niches for herbivores/pathogens, especially for specialists (e.g., the "host diversity begets parasite diversity hypothesis") (15-19). In contrast, dilution assumes that the amount and accessibility of hosts are reduced in more diverse communities, making it difficult for pests to establish (i.e., dilution effects) (20, 21).

Although broadly applied to parasites, the facilitation and dilution effects could also be applied to plant-pest interactions (13). Whether a plant species is colonized by pests depends on what the neighboring plants are and on how many of them there are (e.g., host vs. non-hosts and their relative proportions), as well as on the direct and indirect interactions among neighboring species (6, 13). Here, we hypothesized that both facilitation and dilution can occur within the same forest community at the same time, although their relative strengths may

vary. To test this hypothesis, we used a large dataset encompassing 130,210 forest plots established by the United States Forest Service's Forest Inventory and Analysis Program (FIA; <https://www.fia.fs.fed.us/>) and a county-level pest occurrence dataset covering the conterminous United States (48 states and 2,098 counties) (<https://www.nrs.fs.fed.us/tools/afpe>) to examine the possible effects of native host and non-host tree diversity on nonnative pest/disease invasions.

Results

Generalized linear model (GLM) regression analysis revealed that the relationship between the total number of pest species and tree species diversity (host and non-host tree species combined) was hump-shaped or unimodal (a near-symmetric curve; Fig. 1A). That is, pest diversity was the highest when county tree diversity was ca. 30-35 species (second-order regression, $r^2 = 0.17$, $F = 298.39$, $P < 0.0001$; Fig. 1A). Furthermore, the data formed an envelope (a data cloud), i.e., the relationship is better described or constrained by the hump-shaped boundary. Plots with either low or high tree diversity always had low pest diversity but plots with moderate tree diversity ranged from high to low pest diversity.

In further testing the robustness of the above result, quantile regressions also revealed hump-shaped relationships between native tree species diversity and nonnative pest diversity (Fig. 1A). The relationship transitioned from positive to negative at intermediate levels of tree diversity. The hump-shaped curves were observed for all the quantiles analyzed (Table S1). Similarly, randomly drawn subsets of samples (counties) ($n = 50, 100, 500, \text{ and } 1000$) from the 2,098 total counties included in the analysis yielded similar results to patterns using data from all counties (Fig. S1).

Significance

Understanding the relationship between tree diversity and pest invasions is of critical importance both to the theoretical understanding of invasion ecology and to the development of effective pest management practices to mitigate the enormous damages caused by nonnative pests. However, evidence of facilitation and dilution remains elusive, especially in large-scale natural ecosystems. Using a unique large dataset encompassing 130,210 forest plots with county-level pest occurrence dataset across the United States, we show that tree-pest diversity relationships are hump-shaped. Both facilitation and dilution appear to co-exist but their relative strength varies with overall native tree diversity. Our findings provide insights into the interaction between facilitation and dilution, which are critical for understanding the invasions of forests by nonnative pests.

Reserved for Publication Footnotes

137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204




Fig. 1. The relationships between native tree species diversity (host plus non-host) and pest diversity across the conterminous United States (N = 2,098 counties; Symbol size reflects the relative forest area in each county). (A) Results based on second-order quantile regression for each quantile and polynomial regression for all data (i.e., data in all quantiles combined). The thinner hump-shaped regression curves were based on quantile thresholds of 0.1, 0.25, 0.5, 0.75, 0.85, 0.9, 0.95, and 0.99 from bottom to top, respectively. The corresponding equations and significance for each quantile are given in Table S1. The thicker black curve represents the second-order polynomial regression with all data [counties] considered, $r^2 = 0.17$, $P < 0.001$. In all cases, the pattern switched from positive to negative. (B) The opposite relationships between host tree species diversity and pest diversity, and between non-host tree diversity and pest diversity, across the conterminous United States.




Fig. 2. The relationships between native host/non-host diversity and the diversity of specialist and generalist nonnative invasive pests in the forest ecosystems across the conterminous United States (N = 2,098 counties; Symbol size reflects the relative forest area in each county). (A) Specialists showed a steeper increase with host tree diversity than generalists (in both cases, $P < 0.0001$). (B) Both specialists and generalists showed hump-shaped relationships with non-host tree diversity (in both cases, $P < 0.0001$). The hump-shaped relationship was slightly better than the first-order regression for generalists (AICc = 10479.58 vs. 10485.72) but much stronger for specialists (AICc = 6179.14 vs. 6329.92).

The diversity (defined here as species richness) of nonnative invasive pests increased significantly with host tree diversity but decreased with non-host tree diversity across the conterminous United States (Fig. 1B). The specialist and generalist nonnative invasive pests showed both similarities and differences in their relationships with host and non-host tree diversity, respectively (Fig. 2). The diversity of both specialist and generalist invasive pests increased with host tree diversity, indicating the occurrence of facilitation; but this effect was stronger for specialists than for generalists (Fig. 2a). In contrast to their relationships with host tree diversity, both generalists and specialists exhibited a hump-shaped relationship with non-host tree diversity. That is, pest diversity first increases when non-host diversity is low and then decreases when non-host diversity becomes very high (Fig. 2b).

The structural equation model (SEM) that included selected physical and human factors explained 40% of the variation in pest diversity. We found a significant positive correlation between pest diversity and human population density (a proxy for pest propagule pressure (22-25) and host tree diversity; Fig. 3). Annual mean temperature was negatively related to pest diversity while precipitation had a positive effect. However, forest area and spatial autocorrelation had little effect on the general patterns as

shown by randomly drawn county subsamples with smaller sample sizes and thus with greater physical isolation among themselves (Fig. S1). Spatial autoregression (SAR) and ordinary least square regression (OLS) analyses also showed similar associations between pest diversity and various biological, environmental and human factors (Table S2). Despite the influence of this broad spectrum of external factors (detected either separately from tree diversity by GLM, OLS/SAR or jointly by SEM with native tree diversity also considered), tree diversity imposes significant effects on pest invasions.

Discussion

Our results, especially the hump-shaped patterns, suggest that facilitation and dilution can simultaneously influence pest invasion in the same forest ecosystems (26)(Fig. 1). Both the diversity and biomass of the host trees showed significant positive correlation with pest diversity, indicating the facilitation effect; in contrast, pest diversity was negatively related to the diversity and biomass of non-host trees, suggesting a dilution effect in all these models (Figs. 1b, 2, 3; Table S2). Although in general the relative strengths vary with the overall host community diversity (and the relative proportion of host vs. non-host species), the threshold

205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272




Fig. 3. Estimated structural equation model showing the effects of selected physical and human factors on pest diversity across conterminous United States (N = 2,098 counties). It also shows the effects of these factors on host and non-host tree diversity. Black lines indicate positive effects while the red lines indicate negative effects. The thickness of the lines indicates significance levels. Dashed lines indicate that the effects are non-significant (ns). R^2 represents the relative amount of variance explained for each dependent variable by the model. Values on the left are correlations among selected physical and social variables. The rest of the inserted values indicate the standard path coefficients. Standardized root mean square residual (SRMR) = 0.049, Goodness of Fit Index (GFI) = 0.965, root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) = 0.221, McDonald Centrality = 0.979, Bentler Comparative Fit Index = 0.953, Akaike Information Criterion (AIC) = 377.121. Temperature and precipitation are annual means (see also Table S2). Note that the fit of models that include host and non-host biomass is rather poor, thus those models are not presented.

(the peak of the hump-shaped cloud in Fig. 1) could change with other factors such as climate, resource availability, spatial scale, and habitat fragmentation related to human disturbances (26-28).

One likely explanation of the positive host-pest relationship is that as the number of hosts increases, the total number of niches to support pests also increases (partly through the increased overall niche diversity)(Fig. 1B), especially for specialists, a relationship which is consistent with the “host diversity begets parasite diversity” hypothesis (13, 16). However, the dilution effect could also occur at the entire host community level and/or among host species alone (29). In these cases, dilution suppresses pest invasions when the diversity in the entire host community becomes high enough (Fig. 1A, B)(6, 15, 30, 31). This is because, first, at the whole community level, the mean abundance of each tree species declines with increasing tree diversity (Fig. S2) even as total tree biomass increases, leading to a dilution effect. Facilitation by host species is increasingly diluted by the presence of more coexisting non-host species as shown by the negative relationship between non-host biomass and pest diversity (Fig. S3, Table S2)(6). Second, in a diverse host community, host individuals are more likely isolated from each other due to the presence of non-host species (Fig. 1B), and pests therefore need to search larger areas in order to locate their resources (32, 33). Third, diverse plant communities may support more natural enemies for potential nonnative pests and diseases (34).

When generalists and specialists of nonnative pests are considered separately in terms of their relationships with host trees (Fig. 2a), specialists show a stronger host-pest relationship (i.e., steeper positive slope) than generalists (35). The reason likely is that specialists have fewer host species, and therefore specialists should accumulate more quickly when more hosts are available than should generalists, which do not rely on a single host (36). In contrast, the relationships of generalists and specialists of nonnative pests with non-host trees are also hump-shaped (Fig.

2b). The increasing phase (similar to the left side of Fig. 1A) could also be due to the facilitation effect when overall tree diversity is low and both host and non-host trees are positively related to each other (e.g., in harsh environment or early succession (14)). In addition, the slope of the increasing phase could be partially influenced by the method of how hosts were defined, i.e., tree species were classified for each county as hosts only for pest species present in the county but not for pests that have yet to invade the county. The decreasing phase (an indication of the dilution effect), on the other hand, only becomes apparent when non-host tree diversity reaches a certain level (>15 species for generalists, and >25 for specialists; Fig. 2b). This result could be due to the large difference in their diversity levels (41 specialist pests vs. 25 generalist and oligophagous pests).

Successful establishment of non-native pest populations arriving at a particular level of tree diversity can be simultaneously influenced by many other factors such as propagule pressure, host condition (e.g., age, individual host susceptibility), the abiotic environment, the presence of other pests, and stochastic events (14, 19, 27). Moreover, given the typical lag between arrival and impact and between impact and recognition of impact, these observed invasion patterns are likely to vary over time (i.e., the time lag effect; 5, 37). To better understand pest invasions and impacts on forest ecosystems, the role of native tree diversity needs to be examined within broad anthropogenic and environmental contexts (38). To this end, although SEM reveals significant direct/indirect effects of other selected variables such as human population density, precipitation, temperature, and elevation, none of these had greater effects on pest diversity than host and non-host tree diversity (i.e., generally low r^2 s in Fig. 1B vs. Fig. 3), further suggesting the key role played by native tree diversity in facilitating and resisting pest invasions.

In short, our findings suggest the possible role of native tree diversity in facilitation and dilution of nonnative pest invasions, and thus have important implications for guiding surveillance for new invasive species. Our observations also suggest that concurrent facilitation and dilution by host and non-host trees drive geographical variation in pest invasions along with influences from anthropogenic and physical habitat characteristics. The relative proportion of component tree species (hosts vs. non-hosts) plays a key role in determining pest invasions (39), as indicated by our evidence that host diversity may promote pest diversity while neighboring non-host species could enhance the associational resistance of host species to nonnative pest invasions (6). However, it is important to point out that while our conclusions are based upon field observations in natural ecosystems, their ultimate confirmation would require experimental manipulation, although design and implementation of such an experiment across large spatial scales would be challenging. Recent analyses indicate pest species continue to be introduced and spread around the globe (3). Under climate and land use changes, many tree species could expand, contract, or undergo latitudinal/elevational shifts in their geographical ranges (37, 40). It is crucial to examine how such changes over time and the associated geographical variation in plant diversity and habitat invasibility might affect future pest distributions and invasions.

Methods

The geographical distributions of 91 species of non-native forest insect herbivores and forest pathogens known to cause damage in the USA are recorded at the county level in the Alien Forest Pest Explorer database (<https://www.nrs.fs.fed.us/tools/afpe>(23)). For ecological relevance, we analyzed distribution data on only the 66 pest species (51 insects and 15 pathogens) that primarily utilize native tree species (see Appendix I). These species of insects and pathogens are limited to herbivorous species that feed on foliage, sap, phloem or wood, and exclude predators, pollinators, and detritivores. (See <http://www.nrs.fs.fed.us/tools/afpe> for a more detailed description of this list (23)). Note that the majority of non-native insects, which are not known to cause noticeable damage, are not included in this database due to lack of information about their distributions and impacts. In

this study, we also excluded pests primarily of horticultural trees and crops, and a parasitic plant species (European mistletoe, *Viscum album* L.).

Data on forest tree species composition were collected through the US Forest Service's Forest Inventory and Analysis Program (FIA)(41). FIA uses a quasi-systematic design as part of a consistent national sampling protocol to inventory forest attributes across all ownerships, with a sampling intensity of approximately one plot per 2,428 ha of land (41). The data in this analysis encompass 130,210 permanent fixed-area forest plots (each about 0.067 hectares) located in 2,098 counties (for which both host and non-host trees were identified) across the conterminous United States. We used plot-level data to record the native tree diversity (total number of native tree species occurring on plots in each county) and the total native tree live aboveground biomass (total amount of biomass occurring on plots in the county). In addition, we downloaded FIA's remote-sensing derived estimates of forest cover area for each county.

We used a comprehensive list of invasive pests (66 species, see above), including both species with strict host specialization and many generalists to avoid potential bias in terms of species selection, not a subset of species as in many previous studies. The determination of host specialization and host ranges of pest species followed Liebhold et al. (2013, Table S2), who compiled a list of the primary tree species used as hosts by each pest summarized from the scientific literature, regulatory reports and university extension bulletins or related materials (Appendix I)(23). Each tree species was categorized as a host or non-host for each county based on whether it was a host for any of the 66 damaging invasive forest pests present in the county. To examine the possible presence of facilitation due to the addition of host species and to test whether dilution is truly occurring but not because of the absence of host species, we classified the 66 pest species as specialist ($n = 41$), generalist ($n = 15$), or oligophagous agents (feeding on two or more genera from the same family, or from closely related families; $n = 10$). For this analysis, the oligophagous agents were combined with the generalists. We then conducted additional analyses separately on generalists and specialists by accounting for the presence of suitable host species.

Geographical variation in numbers of established pests may reflect variation in propagule pressure and climate conditions, as well as variation in habitat invasibility, and is likely to be scale-dependent (42). Because the effects of tree diversity on pest invasion are expected to be mediated by associated factors (above) with high collinearity, we used structural equation modeling (SEM) to tease apart these effects and to account for the co-dependence among the responsible variables (43). To examine the possible contribution of spatial autocorrelation, we applied spatial autoregression analyses (SAR) and ordinary least squares (OLSs).

The examined anthropogenic and environmental variables included human population density, native host and non-host tree diversity and biomass, forest area, mean annual temperature and precipitation, and elevation. Population data were compiled from <http://www.census.gov/2010census/>; climate and elevation data were compiled from <http://www.ncdc.noaa.gov/>. To specifically examine the role of tree community diversity (defined here as richness) on the number of nonnative pests, we first analyzed the relationship between all native tree species (host and non-host tree species combined) and nonnative forest pests within each county. We performed regression and quantile regression analysis (44) by binning the county-level data into eight groups based on relative pest diversity, i.e., ≤ 0.1 , 0.11-0.25, 0.26-0.5, 0.51-0.75, 0.76-0.85, 0.86-0.9, 0.91-0.95, and 0.96-0.99, to test the possible presence of facilitation and dilution effects.

Footnotes

¹To whom correspondence should be addressed. Email: qinfeng.guo@usda.gov, sfei@purdue.edu.

Author contributions: Q.G. initiated the research. Q.G., J.W., S.F., K.P., and A.L. performed analyses. S.F. and K.P. reorganized and transformed the county-level forest tree and pest data. All authors contributed to the interpretation of the results and the writing of the manuscript.

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

This article is a PNAS Direct Submission.

Data deposition: Data used in this study are available at an open data repository (Purdue University Research Repository, [https://doi.org/10.4231/1MM0B-JT53\(45\)](https://doi.org/10.4231/1MM0B-JT53(45))).

This article contains supporting information online

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS. We appreciate the help of C. Oswalt and many individuals of the USFS FIA for the forest plot data and J. Canavin in downloading and processing the county-level occurrence data for each pest and pathogen species. We also thank M. Carrig of Duke University for suggestions on structural equation modeling (SEM). This study was partly supported by NSF Macrosystems Biology grants (DEB-1241932 and DEB-1638702) and by Czech OP RDE (EVA4.0, No. CZ.02.1.01/0.0/0.0/16.019/0000803).

1. Keesing F, et al. (2010) Impacts of biodiversity on the emergence and transmission of infectious diseases. *Nature* 468(7324):647-652.

2. Simberloff D, et al. (2013) Impacts of biological invasions: what's what and the way forward. *Trends Ecol Evol* 28(1):58-66.

3. Liebhold AM, et al. (2018) Plant diversity drives global patterns of insect invasions. *Sci Rep-Uk* 8(1):12095.

4. Smith VH, et al. (2015) Crop diversification can contribute to disease risk control in sustainable biofuels production. *Front Ecol Environ* 13(10):561-567.

5. Boyd I, Freer-Smith P, Gilligan C, & Godfray H (2013) The consequence of tree pests and diseases for ecosystem services. *Science* 342(6160):1235773.

6. Barbosa P, et al. (2009) Associational resistance and associational susceptibility: having right or wrong neighbors. *Annu Rev Ecol Syst* 40:1-20.

7. Pagán I, et al. (2012) Effect of biodiversity changes in disease risk: exploring disease emergence in a plant-virus system. *PLoS Pathog* 8(7):e1002796.

8. Luis AD, Kuenzi AJ, & Mills JN (2018) Species diversity concurrently dilutes and amplifies transmission in a zoonotic host-pathogen system through competing mechanisms. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 115:7979-7984.

9. Salkeld DJ, Padgett KA, & Jones JH (2013) A meta-analysis suggesting that the relationship between biodiversity and risk of zoonotic pathogen transmission is idiosyncratic. *Ecol Lett* 16(5):679-686.

10. Halliday FW, Heckman RW, Wilfahrt PA, & Mitchell CE (2017) A multivariate test of disease risk reveals conditions leading to disease amplification. *Proc R Soc B* 284(1865):20171340.

11. Keesing F & Ostfeld RS (2015) Is biodiversity good for your health? *Science* 349(6245):235-236.

12. Haas SE, Hooten MB, Rizzo DM, & Meentemeyer RK (2011) Forest species diversity reduces disease risk in a generalist plant pathogen invasion. *Ecol Lett* 14(11):1108-1116.

13. Jactel H & Brockerhoff EG (2007) Tree diversity reduces herbivory by forest insects. *Ecol Lett* 10(9):835-848.

14. Johnson PT, De Roode JC, & Fenton A (2015) Why infectious disease research needs community ecology. *Science* 349(6252):1259504.

15. Hechinger RF & Lafferty KD (2005) Host diversity begets parasite diversity: bird final hosts and trematodes in snail intermediate hosts. *Proc R Soc Lond B Biol Sci* 272(1567):1059-1066.

16. Johnson PT, et al. (2016) Habitat heterogeneity drives the host-diversity-begets-parasite-diversity relationship: evidence from experimental and field studies. *Ecol Lett* 19(7):752-761.

17. Kamiya T, O'dwyer K, Nakagawa S, & Poulin R (2014) Host diversity drives parasite diversity: meta-analytical insights into patterns and causal mechanisms. *Ecography* 37(7):689-697.

18. Lin YP, Cook DH, Gullan PJ, & Cook LG (2015) Does host-plant diversity explain species richness in insects? A test using Coccidae (Hemiptera). *Ecol Entomol* 40(3):299-306.

19. Johnson PT, Preston DL, Hoverman JT, & LaFonte BE (2013) Host and parasite diversity jointly control disease risk in complex communities. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 110(42):16916-16921.

20. Civitello DJ, et al. (2015) Biodiversity inhibits parasites: broad evidence for the dilution effect. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 112(28):8667-8671.

21. Huang ZY, van Langevelde F, Prins HH, & de Boer WF (2015) Dilution versus facilitation: Impact of connectivity on disease risk in metapopulations. *J Theor Biol* 376:66-73.

22. Liebhold AM, Brockerhoff EG, Garrett LJ, Parke JL, & Britton KO (2012) Live plant imports: the major pathway for forest insect and pathogen invasions of the US. *Front Ecol Environ* 10(3):135-143.

23. Liebhold AM, et al. (2013) A highly aggregated geographical distribution of forest pest invasions in the USA. *Divers Distrib* 19(9):1208-1216.

24. Simberloff D (2009) The role of propagule pressure in biological invasions. *Annu Rev Ecol Syst* 40:81-102.

545		
546	25. Pyšek P, <i>et al.</i> (2010) Disentangling the role of envi-	613
547	ronmental and human pressures on biological invasions across	614
548	Europe. <i>Proc Natl Acad Sci USA</i> 107(27):12157-12162.	615
549	26. Huang ZYX, Van Langevelde F, Estrada-Pena A, Suzan	616
550	G, & De Boer WF (2016) The diversity-disease relationship:	617
551	evidence for and criticisms of the dilution effect. <i>Parasitology</i>	618
552	143(9):1075-1086.	619
553	27. Liu X, Lyu SM, Zhou SR, & Bradshaw CJA (2016)	620
554	Warming and fertilization alter the dilution effect of host diversity	621
555	on disease severity. <i>Ecology</i> 97(7):1680-1689.	622
556	28. Cline LC, <i>et al.</i> (2018) Resource availability underlies	623
557	the plant-fungal diversity relationship in a grassland ecosystem.	624
558	<i>Ecology</i> 99(1):204-216.	625
559	29. Johnson PT, Preston DL, Hoverman JT, & Richgels	626
560	KL (2013) Biodiversity decreases disease through predictable	627
561	changes in host community competence. <i>Nature</i> 494(7436):230.	628
562	30. Johnson PT, Ostfeld RS, & Keesing F (2015) Frontiers in	629
563	research on biodiversity and disease. <i>Ecol Lett</i> 18(10):1119-1133.	630
564	31. Strona G & Lafferty KD (2016) Environmental change	631
565	makes robust ecological networks fragile. <i>Nat Comm</i> 7:12462.	632
566	32. Watts AG, <i>et al.</i> (2018) Host functional connectivity and	633
567	the spread potential of Lyme disease. <i>Landscape Ecol</i> 11:1925-	634
568	1938.	635
569	33. Rottstock T, Joshi J, Kummer V, & Fischer M (2014)	636
570	Higher plant diversity promotes higher diversity of fungal	637
571	pathogens, while it decreases pathogen infection per plant. <i>Ecol-</i>	638
572	<i>ogy</i> 95(7):1907-1917.	639
573	34. Letourneau DK, Jedlicka JA, Bothwell SG, & Moreno CR	640
574	(2009) Effects of natural enemy biodiversity on the suppression	641
575	of arthropod herbivores in terrestrial ecosystems. <i>Annu Rev Ecol</i>	642
576	<i>Evol Syst</i> 40:573-592.	643
577	35. Richards LA, <i>et al.</i> (2015) Phytochemical diversity drives	644
578	plant-insect community diversity. <i>Proc Natl Acad Sci USA</i>	645
579	112(35):10973-10978.	646
580		647
581		648
582		649
583		650
584		651
585		652
586		653
587		654
588		655
589		656
590		657
591		658
592		659
593		660
594		661
595		662
596		663
597		664
598		665
599		666
600		667
601		668
602		669
603		670
604		671
605		672
606		673
607		674
608		675
609		676
610		677
611		678
612		679
		680
	36. Becerra JX (2015) On the factors that promote the diver-	613
	sity of herbivorous insects and plants in tropical forests. <i>Proc Natl</i>	614
	<i>Acad Sci USA</i> 112(19):6098-6103.	615
	37. Bebbler DP (2015) Range-expanding pests and pathogens	616
	in a warming world. <i>Annu Rev Phytopath</i> 53:335-356.	617
	38. Mitchell CE, Tilman D, & Groth JV (2002) Effects of	618
	grassland plant species diversity, abundance, and composition on	619
	foliar fungal disease. <i>Ecology</i> 83(6):1713-1726.	620
	39. Hudgins EJ, Liebhold AM, & Leung B (2017) Predicting	621
	the spread of all invasive forest pests in the United States. <i>Ecol</i>	622
	<i>Lett</i> 20:426-435.	623
	40. Merow C, Bois ST, Allen JM, Xie Y, & Silander JA (2017)	624
	Climate change both facilitates and inhibits invasive plant ranges	625
	in New England. <i>Proc Natl Acad Sci USA</i> 114:E3276-E3284.	626
	41. Reams G, <i>et al.</i> (2005) The Forest Inventory and Anal-	627
	ysis sampling frame. <i>The enhanced forest inventory and analysis</i>	628
	<i>program-national sampling design and estimation procedures</i> , eds	629
	Bechtold WA & Patterson PL (US Department of Agriculture,	630
	Asheville, NC, USA), Vol Gen. Tech. Rep. SRS-80., pp 11-26.	631
	42. Cohen JM, <i>et al.</i> (2016) Spatial scale modulates the	632
	strength of ecological processes driving disease distributions. <i>Proc</i>	633
	<i>Natl Acad Sci USA</i> 113(24):E3359-E3364.	634
	43. Grace JB (2006) <i>Structural Equation Modeling and Natural</i>	635
	<i>Systems</i> (Cambridge University Press).	636
	44. Cade BS & Guo QF (2000) Estimating effects of con-	637
	straints on plant performance with regression quantiles. <i>Oikos</i>	638
	91(2):245-254.	639
	45. Guo Q, Fei, S.L., Potter, K.M., Liebhold, A.M. (2019)	640
	Native tree and nonnative pest (insect and pathogen) species rich-	641
	ness across the conterminous United States. Purdue University	642
	Research Repository. https://doi.org/10.4231/MM0B-JT53 .	643
		644
		645
		646
		647
		648
		649
		650
		651
		652
		653
		654
		655
		656
		657
		658
		659
		660
		661
		662
		663
		664
		665
		666
		667
		668
		669
		670
		671
		672
		673
		674
		675
		676
		677
		678
		679
		680