1 Running Title: Coleoptera and cover crops in tea

2

3 **Effects of cover crops on beetle assemblages in tea plantations**

4 Li-Lin Chen^{1,2}, Gabor Pozsgai^{1,2,3*}, Xiang-Yu Li⁴, Lei Li^{1,2}, Gadi V.P. Reddy⁵ and

5 Min-Sheng You^{1,2, *}

6

* *Correspondence:* Min-Sheng You, State Key Laboratory of Ecological Pest Control for Fujian and Taiwan Crops, College of Plant Protection, Fuzhou, Fujian 350002, China. Tel: +86-591-8379-3035; E-mail: msyou@fafu.edu.cn.

Gabor Pozsgai, State Key Laboratory of Ecological Pest Control for Fujian and Taiwan Crops, College of Plant Protection, Fuzhou, Fujian 350002, China. Tel: +86-150-800-11-322; Fax: +86-591-8376-8251; E-mail: pozsgaig@coleoptera.hu.

- 7 ¹ State Key Laboratory of Ecological Pest Control for Fujian and Taiwan Crops,
8 College of Plant Protection, Fuzhou, Fujian 350002, China
- 9 ² Institute of Applied Ecology, Fujian Agriculture and Forestry University, Fuzhou,
10 Fujian, China
- 11 ³ CE3C – Centre for Ecology, Evolution and Environmental Changes, Azorean
12 Biodiversity Group and Universidade dos Açores, Angra do Heroísmo, Azores,
13 Portugal
- 14 ⁴ Chengjiao Town, Shaowu City, Fujian Province, Shaowu 354300, China
- 15 ⁵ USDA-ARS-Southern Insect Management Research Unit, 141 Experiment Station
16 Rd., P.O. Box 346, Stoneville, MS 38776, USA

Abstract

Beetles are visible members of food webs in tea plantations, with high species richness and abundance. Many tea pests, as well as natural enemies, are members of this order, so a knowledge of how groundcovers affect beetles can aid pest management. We collected beetles in a replicated field experiment in the Wuyi Mountains, Fujian Province China. Tea was intercropped with *Paspalum notatum* or *Chamaecrista rotundifolia*, or rows were cleared to bare ground, or in the control they were left unmanaged to allow weeds to grow naturally. Sampling, done by sweep netting and vegetation beating, was conducted monthly, between May 2006 and April 2008, and Coleoptera abundance, biomass, species richness and assemblage structures were compared between groundcover treatments. Total beetle abundance and species richness were significantly higher in tea intercropped with *C. rotundifolia* and bare ground than in naturally grown weedy control. Whilst there was no difference between predator assemblages among treatments for any measure, herbivores were more abundant, weighed more, and were more diverse in *C. rotundifolia* treatments than in weedy control. Biomass and species richness were also greater in plots with *P. notatum* groundcover than those in weedy control. We found that beetle assemblages varied both seasonally and with ground cover treatment, but the potential pest control impact of more species-rich beetle assemblages was mixed, and further work is needed to gain information on trophic groups with potential benefits for use in non-insecticidal pest management.

Key words: Coleoptera, sustainable tea production, intercropping, diversity, trophic groups

Introduction

Tea (*Camellia sinensis* Kuntze, 1887) is a perennial, evergreen shrub that is widely cultivated throughout the tropics and subtropics, particularly in hilly or mountainous regions (Hazarika *et al.*, 2009; Zhang *et al.*, 2019). Pest damage to tea, however, can reduce its marketability and cause significant losses in yield (Muraleedharan & Chen, 1997). Such problems have led to the overuse of pesticides, which in turn can contaminate tea with pesticide residues, cause pest resistance, and induce pest resurgence due to destruction of natural enemies (Fernandez *et al.*, 1993; Sarkar & Hajra, 1994). Tea production is increasingly associated with prolonged and extensive use of synthetic pesticides. Such use, along with the expansion of crop monocultures, has resulted in pest outbreaks in tea, likely because of the adverse effects of those two management practices on predators and parasitoids (Sudo *et al.*, 1996; Wang *et al.*, 2004). Tea is, however, an important export commodity, and the use of pesticides on this cash crop has recently become more carefully regulated by several agencies and organizations (Ford, 2018; Chen HP *et al.*, 2019; Juncker, 2019). Also, interest has increased in alternative control strategies to replace or reduce use of pesticides and lower their resulting residues (Bian *et al.*, 2014; Guo *et al.*, 2019). Most of these alternative practices focus on efforts to enhance biocontrol ecosystem services provided by natural enemies (Chen *et al.*, 2020).

The beetles (Coleoptera) are an abundant and species-rich order that includes both pests and beneficial species important in tea production. Herbivorous beetles, including bark borers, leaf eating species, and shoot hole borers, can severely reduce tea yield and quality (Table 1). Predatory beetles are believed to help suppress pest Hemiptera in tea (Table 1).

Since the densities of both pests and their natural enemies are influenced by the surrounding vegetation, it is reasonable to manage this environment to enhance biocontrol services if possible (Bastola *et al.*, 2016; Li *et al.*, 2016a; Gurr *et al.*, 2016, 2017).

63 **Table 1** Effects of some Coleoptera species in tea plantations.

Trophic group	Species	Family	Damage/Control type	References
Herbivores				
	<i>Agrilus</i> sp.	Buprestidae	Bark borers	Qi <i>et al.</i> , 1993
	<i>Chreonoma atritarsis</i> (Pic., 1912)	Cerambycidae	Bark borers	Muraleedharan, 1992
	<i>Curculio chinensis</i> Chevrolat, 1878	Curculionidae	Leaf eating species	Muraleedharan, 1992; Yang <i>et al.</i> , 1999; Marshall, 2009
	<i>Mylocherinus aurolineatus</i> Voss, 1937	Curculionidae	Leaf eating species	Qi <i>et al.</i> , 1993
	<i>Basilepta melanopus</i> (Lefèvre, 1893)	Eumolpidae	Leaf eating species	Qi <i>et al.</i> , 1993
	<i>Xyleborus fornicatus</i> Eichh., 1868	Scolytidae	Shot hole borers	Calnaido, 1971; Walgama & Pallemulla, 2005; Walgama & Zalucki, 2007
Predators				
	<i>Cryptolaemus montrouzieri</i> Mulsant, 1853	Coccinellidae	Preys on <i>Aspidiotus destructor</i> Signoret, 1869 (Hemiptera: Diaspididae)	Zhao <i>et al.</i> , 2001
	<i>Hyperaspis sinensis</i> (Crotch, 1874)	Coccinellidae	Preys on <i>Aleurocanthus spiniferus</i> (Quaintance, 1903) (Hemiptera: Aleyrodidae)	Wang <i>et al.</i> , 2001b
	<i>Leis axyridis</i> (Pallas, 1773)	Coccinellidae	Preys on <i>Toxoptera aurantii</i> (Boyer de Fonscolombe, 1841) (Hemiptera: Aphididae), <i>Empoasca vitis</i> (Göthe, 1875) (Hemiptera: Cicadellidae)	Zhang, 2016
	<i>Microaspis discolor</i> (Fabricius, 1798)	Coccinellidae	Preys on <i>Oligonychus coffeae</i> (Nietner, 1861) (Prostigmata: Tetranychidae); <i>Toxoptera aurantii</i> (Boyer de Fonscolombe, 1841) (Hemiptera: Aphididae)	Roy <i>et al.</i> , 2010
	<i>Pharoscyrnus taoi</i> Sasaji, 1967	Coccinellidae	Preys on <i>Aspidiotus destructor</i> Signoret, 1869 (Hemiptera: Diaspididae)	Zhao <i>et al.</i> , 2001
	<i>Stethorus gilvifrons</i> (Mulsant, 1850)	Coccinellidae	Preys on <i>Oligonychus coffeae</i> (Nietner, 1861) (Prostigmata: Tetranychidae)	Perumalsamy <i>et al.</i> , 2010
	<i>Oligota parva</i> Kraatz, 1862	Staphylinidae	Preys on <i>Oligonychus coffeae</i> (Nietner, 1861) (Prostigmata: Tetranychidae)	(Perumalsamy <i>et al.</i> , 2009)

Indeed, intercropping with a variety of cover crops has been used in many crop systems to enhance the action of beneficial organisms. Cover crops can be used to reduce soil erosion, improve soil structure or fertility, increase water infiltration, suppress weeds or nematodes, and improve crop quality (Armecin *et al.*, 2005; Song *et al.*, 2006; Wu *et al.*, 2013; Schipanski *et al.* 2014a). Cover crops that are properly selected and well managed can enhance the abundance and efficacy of natural enemies (Bugg *et al.*, 1991; Landis *et al.*, 2000; Zhao *et al.*, 2016), mostly by providing them with essential resources, such as pollen, honeydew, and nectar (Gurr & Nicol, 2000; Gurr *et al.*, 2017), and providing habitat for mating, oviposition, or shelter (Hossain *et al.*, 2002; Pappas *et al.*, 2017).

Existing evidence on efficacy of cover crops in enhancing beneficial species in tea plantations is mixed (Chen *et al.*, 2019a, b). Song *et al.* (2006) found that predatory Coleoptera abundance was significantly higher in tea interplanted with white clover (*Trifolium repens* L., 1753) compared to tea monocultures, and this change led to better suppression of hemipteran pests. Several plants, including *Corymbia citriodora* (Hook.) Hill *et* Johnson, 1848 and *Lavandula pinnata* Lundmark, 1780 (Zhang *et al.*, 2014a), *Senna tora* (L.) Roxb. (Zhang *et al.*, 2014b), and *Hedyotis uncinella* Hook. *et* Arn., 1833 have also been successfully employed as tea cover crops (Chen, 2002; Song *et al.*, 2006; Zhang *et al.*, 2014a, b).

However, in tea, there is little information on the effect of cover crops on groups like beetles, which can act both as pests and natural enemies, or how cover crops might affect the pest:natural enemy ratios. The impacts of particular cover crop species on beetle assemblages is also poorly understood. Our goal was to assess the effects of cover crops on assemblages of beetles in tea canopies. We tested the hypothesis that ground covers in tea plantations influence the abundance, biomass, and species richness of both herbivore and predatory beetles, affecting the whole assemblage. We predicted that intercropping in tea would increase natural enemy:pest ratios compared to a naturally weedy control, and that this effect would be equally

observable for abundance, biomass, and species richness.

Materials and methods

Study sites

Field experiments were conducted between May 2006 and April 2008 in a 7-year-old Oolong tea (clone Wuyi Shuixian) plantation located at Xingcun in the Wuyi Mountains, Fujian Province, China (27°38'51.4" N and 117°54'29.9" E, 736 m altitude). The tea plantation is situated on red soil and the regional climate is classified as humid subtropical monsoon.

Experimental design

Four ground cover treatments – (1) sown *Paspalum notatum* Flüggé, 1810 (Poaceae) (Pas), (2) sown *Chamaecrista rotundifolia* Greene, 1899 (Fabaceae) (Cas), (3) bare ground (Bar), and (4) natural weedy ground cover (Nat) – were compared in a fully randomized design with three replicates of each treatment. Naturally grown weedy ground cover served as the control in our experiment. *P. notatum* and *C. rotundifolia* were manually sown in May 2006 at a seed rate of 45 kg/ha and 7.5 kg/ha, respectively. In the bare ground treatment weeds were manually cleared each month without the use of herbicide. Tea intercropped with *P. notatum* or *C. rotundifolia* were kept nearly weed-free by mowing, and both treatments and natural ground cover were mowed between tea rows to a 5 cm stubble height in both years in September. Plot size was 340 m² (17 m × 20 m), and plots were spaced 5 m apart. Experimental plots differed from the conventionally managed areas only by the intercropping strategy employed and freedom from the use of insecticides. In all other respects they were maintained following the recommended agronomic practice and had similar natural conditions, such as geographical features, topography, and soil texture.

Insect sampling

The tea canopy was sampled monthly. Samples were taken from five randomly selected 1 m² areas of canopy in each plot. Six white trays (36 cm × 45 cm) were placed beneath tea bushes, 30 sweeps with a net (38.1 cm diameter hoop) were performed, and then the tea canopy was beaten 20 times. Insects in nets and on trays were transferred to plastic bags and frozen for later identification to species or morphospecies. Average wet weight of the insects preserved in alcohol was measured individually for 1 to 80 specimens of each collected species to the nearest mg with a Swiss Mettler AB204-S electronic balance for insect biomass estimation. Before being weighed, specimens were dried on absorbent paper to remove excess alcohol (as per Zintzen *et al.*, 2008). For each species, the average weight (n = 1-80, depending on availability) was taken as the biomass value for that species. This biomass value was then multiplied by the number of individuals of that species in each sample.

Beetles were assigned to trophic groups as herbivores, predators, omnivores, or saprophages, based on the literature (Pang & Mao, 1979; Zhang & Tan, 2004; Zhang & Li, 2011; Ren *et al.*, 2016) and behavioral observations at the study sites. Voucher specimens were preserved in 75% alcohol and stored at the Institute of Applied Ecology, Fujian Agriculture and Forestry University.

Data analysis

Data from the five subsamples were pooled, and mean species richness, mean abundance, and mean biomass of the replicates were calculated for total Coleoptera and for each of the four trophic groups, respectively. Because of their limited importance compared to predators and herbivores, these values for saprophagous and omnivorous trophic groups were not analyzed separately, and species belonging to these groups were only included in the analysis when overall numbers were compared.

Linear mixed effect models (LMER) were used to compare beetle richness, abundance and biomass amongst treatments with sampling months included as a fixed effect and sampling dates as a random effect. Satterthwaite's method for calculating degrees of freedom was used to obtain P-values, with the help of the *lmerTest* R package (Kuznetsova *et al.*, 2017). Least-squares means were computed, and all treatment combinations compared using the *lsmeans* package (Lenth, 2016) in R (R Development Core Team, 2019) and P-values adjusted using Tukey's method. All comparisons were repeated separately for all beetles, herbivores only, predatory beetles only, and for the predator: herbivore ratios. The normality of both within-cluster residuals and the residuals of random effects were individually checked using standard Q-Q plots and Shapiro-tests. Homogeneity of the variances was tested using Levene-tests.

Whether or not treatments had a significant effect on beetle assemblages was tested using principal response curve analysis (PRC), with repeated observations. Permutational ANOVA with 999 iterations was used to validate the model, and the most influential species were highlighted. PRC was repeated for pooled beetle abundance and biomass, herbivore and predator abundances each separately, and herbivore and predator biomass each separately. Multivariate analysis was conducted using the *vegan* (Oksanen *et al.*, 2019) R package.

For LMER models both count and biomass data were log-transformed, as $\log(x+1)$ and $\log(x+0.01)$, respectively. Before calculating the predator: herbivore ratios, count data were $\log(x+1)$, and biomass data were cube-root ($\sqrt[3]{(x + 0.01)}$) transformed, and the cube-root and log-transformed values of these proportions, respectively, were included in the model as response variables. Richness proportions were cube-root transformed. For multivariate analysis, abundance data were transformed using Hellinger transformation and biomass data were log-transformed ($\log(x+0.01)$).

Results

Overview of results

Altogether, 28,394 individuals of 117 species of beetles were captured during the 23 months of this experiment (Table 2.). Of these 117 species, 66 were categorized as herbivores, 29 as predators, and 22 as other feeding types that included omnivores, saprophages, or mixed feeders (see Supplementary material 1 for the full species list and categorization).

Table 2 Abundance, biomass, and species richness of beetles collected in intercropped tea plantations, under four different groundcover treatments, in China over a two year period, segregated by beetle feeding type.

	Feeding trait	Herbivore	Omnivore	Predator	Saprophage	Total
Abundance	Pas [†]	5341	21	1334	162	6858
	Cas [‡]	5893	23	1290	251	7457
	Bar [§]	6841	22	940	163	7966
	Nat ^{††}	5196	11	795	111	6113
	Total	23271	77	4359	687	28394
Biomass	Pas	252.43	0.16	2.42	0.33	255.35
	Cas	215.66	0.16	2.49	0.40	218.70
	Bar	292.50	0.18	1.61	0.30	294.59
	Nat	245.94	0.09	1.08	0.16	247.27
	Total	1006.54	0.58	7.60	1.19	1015.91
Species richness	Pas	41	6	16	5	68
	Cas	33	6	19	5	63
	Bar	34	10	17	4	65
	Nat	36	6	20	4	66
	Total	66	16	29	6	117

[†] Pas: sown *Paspalum notatum*; [‡] Cas: sown *Chamaecrista rotundifolia*; [§] Bar: bare ground; ^{††} Nat: natural ground cover.

Abundance

Both treatment and sampling month significantly affected differences between the log-transformed beetle abundance but their combined effect was not significant. This model had a total explanatory power of 84.9%, in which the fixed effects explained 67.1% of the variance (Table 3). Pairwise comparison of the treatments revealed significantly greater log-abundance in Cas treatment than in Nat ($P = 0.014$, Fig. 1 A). There was no significant effect of treatment for herbivorous beetle, but treatment did have a significant effect for predator log-abundance (Table 3).

Table 3 Results of REML modelling for log abundance, log biomass, and species richness, separately for pooled data, for feeding traits, and for herbivore-predator ratios. Total and fixed effect (in brackets) variances explained by the model are indicated.

	<i>Sum Sq</i>	<i>Mean Sq</i>	<i>Num Df</i>	<i>Den Df</i>	<i>Statistic</i>	<i>P-Value</i>
<i>Pooled log-abundance Variance explained (%) = 84.9 (67.1)</i>						
<i>TR</i>	2.816	0.939	3	217	3.641	0.014*
<i>month</i>	20.285	1.844	11	11	7.153	0.001**
<i>TR:month</i>	4.610	0.140	33	217	0.542	0.981
<i>Herbivore log-abundance Variance explained (%) = 88.8 (69.9)</i>						
<i>TR</i>	1.808	0.603	3	217	1.452	0.229
<i>month</i>	32.735	2.976	11	11	7.171	0.001**
<i>TR:month</i>	13.596	0.412	33	217	0.993	0.485
<i>Predator log-abundance Variance explained (%) = 71.0 (27.7)</i>						
<i>TR</i>	7.011	2.337	3	217	7.012	< 0.001***
<i>month</i>	3.758	0.342	11	11	1.025	0.484
<i>TR: month</i>	10.060	0.305	33	217	0.915	0.606
<i>Predator-herbivore log-abundance ratios Variance explained (%) = 30.5 (19.5)</i>						
<i>TR</i>	0.353	0.118	3	217	0.766	0.514
<i>month</i>	3.477	0.316	11	11	2.054	0.124
<i>TR:month</i>	5.637	0.171	33	217	1.110	0.321
<i>Pooled log-biomass Variance explained (%) = 87.9 (46.8)</i>						
<i>TR</i>	1.567	0.522	3	217	0.714	0.545
<i>month</i>	18.102	1.646	11	11	2.249	0.097
<i>TR:month</i>	19.477	0.590	33	217	0.807	0.766
<i>Herbivore log-biomass Variance explained (%) = 86.6 (46.8)</i>						
<i>TR</i>	1.433	0.478	3	217	0.498	0.684
<i>month</i>	24.233	2.203	11	11	2.296	0.092
<i>TR:month</i>	31.360	0.950	33	217	0.991	0.488
<i>Predator log-biomass Variance explained (%) = 60.6 (25.0)</i>						
<i>TR</i>	2.883	0.961	3	217	4.205	0.006**

<i>month</i>	2.463	0.224	11	11	0.980	0.513
<i>TR:month</i>	8.405	0.255	33	217	1.114	0.316
<i>Predator-herbivore log-biomass ratios Variance explained (%) = 69.4 (40.3)</i>						
<i>term</i>						
<i>TR</i>	0.271	0.090	3	217	0.672	0.570
<i>month</i>	4.392	0.399	11	11	2.972	0.042*
<i>TR:month</i>	4.554	0.138	33	217	1.027	0.434
<i>Pooled species richness Variance explained (%) = 55.7 (20.4)</i>						
<i>TR</i>	53.493	17.831	3	217	4.822	0.003**
<i>month</i>	28.270	2.570	11	11	0.695	0.722
<i>TR:month</i>	113.293	3.433	33	217	0.928	0.584
<i>Herbivore species richness Variance explained (%) = 52.4 (11.4)</i>						
<i>TR</i>	4.116	1.372	3	217	1.005	0.391
<i>month</i>	3.406	0.310	11	11	0.227	0.990
<i>TR:month</i>	46.565	1.411	33	217	1.034	0.424
<i>Predator species richness Variance explained (%) = 49.8 (28.6)</i>						
<i>TR</i>	14.531	4.844	3	217	5.001	0.002**
<i>month</i>	15.452	1.405	11	11	1.450	0.274
<i>TR:month</i>	42.616	1.291	33	217	1.333	0.117
<i>Predator-herbivore species richness ratios Variance explained (%) = 46.1 (16.7)</i>						
<i>TR</i>	0.044	0.015	3	217	0.544	0.653
<i>month</i>	0.177	0.016	11	11	0.600	0.795
<i>TR:month</i>	0.975	0.030	33	217	1.099	0.335

186 Significance codes: ‘*’, $P < 0.05$; ‘**’, $P < 0.01$; ‘***’, $P < 0.001$.

Fig. 1 Diffograms showing the differences amongst the calculated least-square means of treatments for A) total log-abundance, B) herbivore log-abundance, C) predator log-abundance, and the D) predator:herbivore log-abundance ratios. In each individual graph, the green, dashed, diagonal line indicates zero difference between two least-square means (line of equality), and each solid line represent one pairwise comparison between treatments. When pairwise comparison lines do not cross the line of equality, differences are significant ($P < 0.05$ after adjusting with the Tukey's method). Significant differences are indicated with red color, lines with non-significant differences are blue. Horizontal and vertical axes are identical, indicating the range of least-square means. Pas: sown *Paspalum notatum*; Cas: sown *Chamaecrista rotundifolia*; Bar: bare ground; Nat: natural ground cover.

Log-abundance of the predators differed significantly between the Nat and Cas groundcovers ($P < 0.001$), the Nat and Pas groundcovers ($P = 0.009$), and the Bar and Cas ground covers ($P =$

0.015), with predators being less abundant in Nat than in Pas or Cas, and more abundant in Cas than in Nat (Fig. 1 B-C). There was no significant difference between the treatments in predator–herbivore log-abundance ratios (Table 3, Fig. 1 D). Detailed time series comparisons between treatment effects on abundance in relation to sampling date are shown in Supplementary material 2 and Supplementary Material 3.

Biomass

Although the model based on total biomass explained 87.89% of the variance, only 46.79% of this amount was attributed to the fixed effects and neither sampling month nor treatments had a statistically significant relationship with total beetle biomass (Table 3, Fig. 2 A). Similarly, none of the fixed variables showed a significant effect when only herbivores were included in the model (Table 3). Predator biomass, on the other hand, was significantly different between treatments (Table 3, Fig. 2 B), with both intercropping treatments having greater beetle biomass than the Nat treatment (Pas: $P = 0.02$, Cas: $P = 0.01$, Fig. 2 C). The ratios of predators to herbivores did not show a significant treatment effect, but the effect of sampling month was significant (Table 3). For detailed information on model outputs readers should consult Supplementary material 2 and Supplementary material 4 for monthly comparison of treatments on biomass.

Species richness

Total species richness was significantly greater in Bar and Cas treatments compared to the Nat treatment ($P = 0.014$ and $P = 0.004$, respectively), while marginally significantly greater in the Pas treatment ($P = 0.051$). This model explains 55.74% of the total variance, of which the fixed effects explain 20.42% (Table 3, Fig. 3 A).

None of the fixed effects indicated any significant difference when only herbivore richness was considered but treatment effect was significant for predators alone (Table 3), showing greater species richness in both Bar and Cas treatments than in the Nas treatment ($P = 0.073$ and $P =$

0.001, respectively, Fig. 3 B-C). The total explanatory power for the predatory species richness model was 49.85%, of which the fixed effects explained 28.60%. Detailed numerical outputs of the model can be found in Supplementary material 2 and time-series plots of treatment effects on species richness-related variables are shown in Supplementary material 5.

Fig. 2 Diffograms showing the differences amongst the calculated least-square means of treatments for **A)** total log-biomass, **B)** herbivore log-biomass, **C)** predator log-biomass, and the **D)** predator: herbivore log-biomass ratios. In each individual graph diagonal green, dashed line indicates zero difference between two least-square means (line of equality), and each solid line represent one pairwise comparison between treatments. When pairwise comparison lines do not cross the line of equality differences are significant ($P < 0.05$ after adjusting with the Tukey's method). Significant differences are indicated with red color, lines with non-significant differences are blue. Horizontal and vertical axes are identical, indicating the range of least-square means. Pas:

sown *Paspalum notatum*; Cas: sown *Chamaecrista rotundifolia*; Bar: bare ground; Nat: natural ground cover.

Fig 3 Diffograms showing the differences amongst the calculated least-square means of treatments for **A)** total species richness, **B)** herbivore species richness, **C)** predator species richness, and the **D)** predator: herbivore species richness ratios. In each individual graph, diagonal green dashed line indicates zero difference between two least-square means (line of equality), and each solid line represent one pairwise comparison between treatments. When pairwise comparison lines do not cross the line of equality differences are significant ($P < 0.05$ after adjusting with the Tukey's method). Significant differences are indicated with red color, lines with non-significant differences are blue. Horizontal and vertical axes are identical indicating the range of least-square means. Pas: sown *Paspalum notatum*; Cas: sown *Chamaecrista rotundifolia*; Bar: bare ground; Nat: natural ground cover.

Treatment Effect on Beetle Assemblages

Principal response curve analysis showed significant treatment effect for species assemblages

when 1) total species abundance, 2) only herbivore abundance, and 3) predator biomass variables were used as the input data matrix (Table 4).

Table 4 Results of permutational ANOVAs on principal response curve (PRC) models, based on different community matrices. Number of permutations is 999, and degrees of freedom is 69 in every cases. Statistically significant models are highlighted with bold font face.

Assemblage based on	Variance	F-Value	P-Value
Pooled abundance	0.063	1.11	0.014*
Herbivore abundance	0.087	1.19	0.002**
Predator abundance	0.078	1.06	0.200
Pooled biomass	0.755	1.08	0.180
Herbivore biomass	0.009	0.64	0.990
Predator biomass	< 0.001	1.19	0.048*

Significance codes: ‘*’, $P < 0.05$; ‘**’, $P < 0.01$

Effects show a distinctive seasonality for abundance-related datasets, whereas this temporal influence was not apparent when biomass-based datasets were used. There was an obvious dominance of herbivores in the assemblages, regardless of whether data matrices were based on abundance or biomass. The most abundant species – *Epuraea luteola* Erichson, 1843 (Nitidulidae), *Migneauxia lederi* Reitter, 1875 (Lathriidae), *Myloccerinus aurolineatus* Voss, 1937 (Curculionidae), and *Basilepta melanopus* (Lefèvre, 1893) (Eumolpidae) – become more dominant over time within the treatments, while *Serangium japonicum* Chapin, 1940 (Coccinellidae) and *Pharoscyrnus taoi* Sasaji, 1967 (Coccinellidae) decreased in relative importance over time. However, if only predators were included in the model, only *P. taoi* was affected negatively. This decline in relative importance in the assemblages was only prominent when models were based on abundance. Compared to the control (Nas), biomass-based importance of *Cryptogonus postmedialis* Kapur, 1948 (Coccinellidae) increased in all treatments (Fig. 4).

273

274

Fig. 4 Principal response curves models based on **A)** abundance data when total species are included, **B)** abundance data of herbivore species, **C)** abundance data of predatory species, **D)** biomass data of total species, **E)** biomass data of herbivore species, and **F)** biomass data of predatory species. Time range starts in May, 2006, and it ends in April 2008. The solid red line represents the bare ground treatment, the dashed green line, the *Chamaecrista rotundifolia* treatment and the dotted green-brown line, the *Paspalum notatum* treatment. The horizontal grey line indicates the natural ground cover control. The most influential species in shaping assemblage differences are marked on the right side of the graph. Abbreviations as: Aulaindi – *Aulacophora indica*, Basimela

– *Basilepta melanopus*, Cryppost – *Cryptogonus postmedialis*, Epurlute – *Epuraea luteola*, Leisaxyr – *Leisaxyridis*, Mignlede – *Migneauxia lederi*, Myllauro – *Myloцерinus aurolineatus*, Ochyquad – *Ochyromera quadrimaculata*, Phartaoi – *Pharoscymnus taoi*, Serajapo – *Serangium japonicum*.

Discussion

In this study we investigated the effects of cover crops on beetle assemblages in tea plantations and showed distinctive, yet sometimes weak, diversity increases with cover crop treatments. We mostly found species that are common in tea growing areas, with a high herbivore dominance in the assemblages (Marshall, 1938; Benjamin, 1968; Shiao, 1977; Qi *et al.*, 1993; Wang *et al.*, 2001a, Zhao *et al.*, 2001; Chen *et al.*, 2009a; Dai, 2010).

We found greater abundance and species richness in the Cas treatment than in the Nat control, indicating a positive effect of this cover crops on beetle biodiversity. Cover crops are generally thought to provide a more sheltered, favorable overwintering microclimate and offer more food than bare ground (Altieri *et al.*, 1985; Lassau *et al.*, 2005; Gurr *et al.*, 2017). In our case, however, although *C. rotundifolia* appeared to attract a greater beetle biodiversity into the tea canopy than naturally weedy rows, there was no significant difference between the two sown treatments and plots where tea rows were manually weeded (Bar). Whereas this seemingly contradicts the improved microhabitat hypothesis, the explanation may lie in the seasonality of our treatments. Cover crops were mowed for the winter; thus, the sudden disturbance and the decreased amount of spatially diverse overwintering habitats made the refuge potential of all four treatments similar.

Indeed, there was a distinct seasonality observable in our dataset: both the total abundance and total biomass increased substantially in the winter months (December to February) (Ye *et al.*, 2010; Chen, 2011), while species richness remained within the previously observed range (Supplementary material 3-5). This increase was mainly caused by the large numbers of the nitidulid *E. luteola*. Since this winter effect was similar in all treatments, it did not result in a

statistically significant treatment effect. The role of the evergreen tea as a winter refuge for herbivorous insects may be the driving factor in shaping this phenomenon, but the fact that there was no comparable growth in numbers of predatory beetles, which could have used the same habitat as refuge, does not support this hypothesis. Alternatively, the timing of tea flowering in Wuyi coincided with the mass appearance of a pollen feeding insect in this period, which may offer a better explanation (Chen *et al.*, 2009b). Indeed, the predator: herbivore ratios decreased during these months, pointing to a disproportional increase in pollen feeders.

Both predatory beetle abundance and biomass were greater in both of the two sown treatments compared to the control, but this did not translate to a reduction in the number of herbivores. Whether this was the result of an insufficient increase of effective predators to control herbivores, or merely seasonality or other variables masking the effect is yet to be clarified. Indeed, the positive effect of cover crops on the abundance and biomass of natural enemies was more visible in the first year, and it became less pronounced in the second year. This change suggests that temporal factors, particularly the growing period of the cover crop, played an important role in determining to what extent a given plant species, or species mix, can contribute toward increasing natural enemy abundance (Bugg *et al.*, 1991; Wei *et al.*, 2010; Schipanski *et al.*, 2014b; Trichard *et al.*, 2014; Rivers *et al.* 2020). Alternatively, since flowering leguminous plants such as *C. rotundifolia* can support a greater abundance of herbivorous Coleoptera, particularly *E. luteola* and various weevils, and these plants also produce dense foliage that is favorable for herbivores (Chen, 2011), the net effect on increased predator numbers may be nil because herbivores have also increased.

Another potential explanation of why in some months, abundance differences between treatments could not been detected, could be that in intercropped tea gardens, beetles did not move onto tea plants if a suitable cover vegetation was available. Consequently, it is unclear if cover crops, which provide abundant resources, would act as a “source” or as a “sink” for

predatory beetles in agroecosystems (Corbett & Plant, 1993).

Nonetheless, large populations of a few species of predators may be insufficient to efficiently suppress a wide variety of pests (Bugg *et al.*, 1991). Moreover, greater predator abundance may not necessarily improve pest control, particularly of herbivorous beetles, when predatory beetles do not particularly target the key pest species (Bugg *et al.*, 1991; Baggen & Gurr, 1998). Increasing biodiversity allows a more efficient resource exploitation (Snyder *et al.*, 2006; Li *et al.*, 2016b), and consequently, the increase in species richness (as a proxy for biodiversity) in our Cas treatments implies a potential ability of this cover crop to result in pest suppression.

Both in terms of total biodiversity and abundance or richness of predatory beetles, Cas generally performed better than Pas. Nevertheless, weeded, bare ground rows (Bar) also showed significantly higher species richness than in the control. The underlying mechanisms of the two significant differences, however, are probably different; *C. rotundifolia* likely attracts beneficial insects by providing shelter or other resources (Chen *et al.*, 2019a, b), whereas bare soil surfaces open up opportunities for ambush predators to easily find prey (Schmidt & Rypstra, 2010). Since these normally generalist species that are specifically adapted to disturbed habitats are more likely to stay in the adjacent field margins, their long-term value in tea canopies as biological control agents may be limited.

On the other hand, one of the additional benefits of cover crops may be promoting biodiversity including the diversity of economically insignificant species (Nicholls & Altieri 2013; Li *et al.*, 2016; de Pedro *et al.*, 2020), and thus they can be of high conservation interest. Theoretically, since cover crops are a more heterogeneous ecosystem with available niches (Rosenzweig, 1995; Dufour *et al.*, 2006), they should support more species. However, for long-term increase of arthropod biodiversity, ephemeral habitats like seasonal cover crops, are less likely to be beneficial than more stable habitats (Rivers *et al.*, 2020). Therefore, if nature

conservation is also to be considered, choosing the right cover plant(s) is crucial.

Whilst treatments in our study influenced beetle assemblages, temporal fluctuations of the superdominant species *E. luteola* made the effects inconclusive. Despite the significant differences in predator abundance, abundance-based assemblages of predators did not show significant treatment effects. Alternately, fluctuating populations of two of the, most likely competing, coccinellids (*S. japonicum* and *P. taoi*) was also visible, and this may have been what was driving the changes in these beetle assemblages.

While the results of this study illustrate the influence of cover crops on beetle assemblages in tea plantations, all of our treatments had advantages and disadvantages. If there are no obvious economic benefits of sown cover crops over naturally occurring weed cover (i.e., no increase from cover crops in herbivore control), then farmers are likely to choose the least labor-intensive, yet profitable management (Song *et al.*, 2006; Zhan *et al.*, 2018; Chen *et al.*, 2019a; Rivers *et al.*, 2020). Since natural ground cover is unlikely to be favored by farmers (even though it may host considerable biodiversity), planting a variety of cover crops may be an acceptable compromise between entirely cleared and weedy rows in tea plantations. Besides promoting biodiversity, with a careful selection of plant species mix the additional benefits (such as soil physical and chemical properties improvement, carbon retention, microbial activity enhancement, and erosion control) of plant cover would be maximized (Wu *et al.*, 2013; Sahoo *et al.*, 2016; Fu *et al.*, 2018; Khan & Verma, 2018; Zhan *et al.*, 2018; Fu *et al.* 2020). This approach would still provide the benefits of a diverse cover vegetation, and as a consequence of greater diversity of other organisms, which would likely reduce overwintering pest herbivores in tea plantations. Assessing the detailed effects of plant species, or any mixture of these, from a wide ecological perspective is needed though before practitioners and farmers can be advised of their value. Further research is necessary to understand other aspects, particularly seasonality and temporal variation, of how cover crops drive beetle diversity and

assemblages. Simultaneously maximizing biodiversity and pest control using cover crops may be a copious task but the delivery of these multiple ecosystem services will benefit both sustainable agriculture and nature conservation.

Acknowledgments

We express our appreciation to the Planters and Managers of Fujian Wuyishan Yongsheng Industrial Tea Company Ltd. for providing us with a tea plantation for our field experiments in the Wuyi Mountains, Fujian Province, China. We thank Jenni A. Stockan for her edits and correction of the English in the final version of the manuscript. This work was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (No. 31501650), National Key R & D Program of China (No. 2016YFD0200900), Fujian Agriculture and Forestry University Construction Project for Technological Innovation and Service System of Tea Industry Chain (No. K1520005 A03), Fujian Spark Program (No. 2018S0019), “111” Program: Innovation Center for Ecologically Based Pest Management of Subtropical Crops (No. D16012).

Disclosure

All authors declare no potential conflicts of interest.

References

- Altieri, M.A., Wilson, R.C. and Schmidt, L.L. (1985) The effects of living mulches and weed cover on the dynamics of foliage- and soil-arthropod communities in three crop systems. *Crop Protection*, 4, 201-213.
- Armecin, R.B., Seco, M.H.P., Caintic, P.S. and Milleza, E.J.M. (2005) Effect of leguminous cover crops on the growth and yield of abaca (*Musa textilis* Nee). *Industrial Crops and Products*, 21, 317-323.

408 Baggen, L.R. and Gurr, G.M. (1998) The influence of food on *Copidosoma koehleri*
409 (Hymenoptera: Encyrtidae), and the use of flowering plants as a habitat management tool to
410 enhance biological control of potato moth, *Phthorimaea operculella* (Lepidoptera:
411 Gelechiidae). *Biological Control*, 11, 9-17.

412 Bastola, A., Parajulee, M.N., Porter, R.P., Shrestha, R.B., Chen, F.J. and Carroll, S.C. (2016)
413 Intercrop movement of convergent lady beetle, *Hippodamia convergens* (Coleoptera:
414 Coccinellidae), between adjacent cotton and alfalfa. *Insect Science*, 23, 145-156.

415 Benjamin, D.M. (1968) Insects and mites on tea in Africa and adjacent islands. *East African*
416 *Agricultural and Forestry Journal*, 33, 345-357.

417 Bian, L., Sun, X.L., Luo, Z.X., Zhang, Z.Q. and Chen, Z.M. (2014) Design and selection of
418 trap color for capture of the tea leafhopper, *Empoasca vitis*, by orthogonal optimization.
419 *Entomologia Experimentalis et Applicata*, 151, 247-258.

420 Bugg, R.L., Dutcher, J.D. and Mcneill, P.J. (1991) Cool-season cover crops in the pecan
421 orchard understory: effects on Coccinellidae (Coleoptera) and pecan aphids (Homoptera:
422 Aphididae). *Biological Control*, 1, 8-15.

423 Calnaido, D. (1971) Differences in susceptibility of tea clones in Ceylon to the shot-hole borer
424 beetle, *Xyleborus fornicatus* Eichh. (Coleoptera: Scolytidae). *Zeitschrift für Angewandte*
425 *Entomologie*, 68, 300-307.

426 Chen, H.P., Wang, C., Wang, Q.H., Liu, X. and Lu, C.Y. (2019) Two new pesticides added to
427 the standard for pesticide residue in tea. *China Tea*, 41, 44-46 (in Chinese).

428 Chen, L.L. (2011) Effects of tea intercropped with ground cover on the composition and
429 structure of arthropods and other related animals. PhD Thesis, Fujian Agriculture and
430 Forestry University, Fuzhou, China. 310 pp (in Chinese).

431 Chen, L.L., Yuan, P., Pozsgai, G., Chen, P., Zhu, H. and You, M.S. (2019a) The impact of cover
432 crops on the predatory mite *Anystis baccarum* (Acari, Anystidae) and the leafhopper pest

433 *Empoasca onukii* (Hemiptera, Cicadellidae) in a tea plantation. *Pest Management Science*,
434 75, 3371-3380.

435 Chen, L.L., Yuan, P., You, M.S., Pozsgai, G., Ma, X., Zhu, H. *et al.* (2019b) Cover crops
436 enhance natural enemies while help suppressing pests in a tea plantation. *Annals of the*
437 *Entomological Society of America*, 112, 348-355.

438 Chen, S.B., Wei, Z.J., Zeng, Z.H., Chen, L.L., Chen, H.T. and You, M.S. (2009a) Effects of
439 nitrogen application on beetle communities in tea plantations. *Insect Science*, 16, 185-192.

440 Chen, S.B., Zeng, Z.H., You, M.S., Chen, L.L. and Wei, Z.J. (2009b) Composition, structure
441 and diversity of animal community in a tea plantation of Wuyishan. *Natural Enemies of*
442 *Insects*, 31, 1-13 (in Chinese)

443 Chen, Y.G. (2002) Study on diversity retaining of arthropod and sustainable controlling of
444 insect pests in tea orchards. MSc Thesis, South China Agricultural University, Guangzhou,
445 China. 68 pp (in Chinese).

446 Chen, Z.M., Cai, X.M., Zhou, L., Bian, L. and Luo, Z.X. (2020) Developments on tea plant
447 pest control in past 40 years in China. *China Tea*, 42, 1-8 (in Chinese).

448 Corbett, A. and Plant, R.E. (1993) Role of movement in the response of natural enemies to
449 agroecosystem diversification: a theoretical evaluation. *Environmental Entomology*, 22,
450 519-531.

451 Dai, X. (2010) Studies on insect and geographical distribution of tea pests in Guizhou province.
452 *Journal of Guizhou Tea*, 38, 21-35 (in Chinese).

453 De Pedro, L., Perera-Fernández, L.G., López-Gallego, E., Pérez-Marcos, M. and Sanchez, J.A.
454 (2020) The effect of cover crops on the biodiversity and abundance of ground-dwelling
455 arthropods in a Mediterranean pear orchard. *Agronomy*, 10, 580.

456 Dufour, A., Gadallah, F., Wagner, H.H., Guisan, A. and Buttler, A. (2006) Plant species
457 richness and environmental heterogeneity in a mountain landscape: effects of variability and

458 spatial configuration. *Ecography*, 29, 573-584.

459 Fernandez, N., Sierra, M., Garcia, J.J., Diez, M.J. and Teran, M.T. (1993) Organochlorine
460 pesticide residues in black tea, camomile, and linden. *Bulletin of Environmental*
461 *Contamination and Toxicology*, 50, 479-485.

462 Ford, M. (2018) China releases standard for maximum residue limits in foods. *National food*
463 *safety standards maximum residue limits for 43 pesticides such as paraquat in food* (ed. F.B.
464 Staffs). FAS Beijing Staff, Beijing, China. 27 pp (in Chinese).

465 Fu, H.P., Zhou, P.Q., Wang, Y.J., Mo, Z.D., Li, Z.H., Ma, Q.P. *et al.* (2020) Effects of
466 intercropping different green manures on fungal community characteristics in rhizosphere
467 soil of tea plant. *Journal of Tea Communication*, 47, 406-415 (in Chinese).

468 Fu, Y.Q., Li, J., Li, J.A., Sun, Y., Lei, X.L., He, Y.C. *et al.* (2018) Effect of sod culture on soil
469 characteristics, microorganisms and enzymatic activities of *Camellia oleifera* land.
470 *Economic Forest Researches*, 36, 82-88 (in Chinese).

471 Guo, Z.M., Cheng, F.Y., Ma, M.J. and Tu, X.L. (2019) Advances in green control technology of
472 *Empoasca pirusuga* Matumura in tea region of south Hubei province. *Hubei Agricultural*
473 *Sciences*, 58, 9-12 (in Chinese).

474 Gurr, G.M., Lu, Z.X., Zheng, X.S., Xu, H.X., Zhu, P.Y., Chen, G.H. *et al.* (2016) Multi-country
475 evidence that crop diversification promotes ecological intensification of agriculture. *Nature*
476 *Plants*, 2, 16014.

477 Gurr, G.M. and Nicol, H.I. (2000) Effect of food on longevity of adults of *Trichogramma*
478 *carverae* Oatman and Pinto and *Trichogramma nr brassicae* Bezdenko (Hymenoptera:
479 Trichogrammatidae). *Australian Journal of Entomology*, 39, 185-187.

480 Gurr, G.M., Wratten, S.D., Landis, D.A. and You, M.S. (2017) Habitat management to suppress
481 pest populations: progress and prospects. *Annual Review of Entomology*, 62, 91-109.

482 Hazarika, L.K., Bhuyan, M. and Hazarika, B.N. (2009) Insect pests of tea and their

management. *Annual Review of Entomology*, 54, 267-284.

Hossain, Z., Gurr, G.M., Wratten, S.D. and Raman, A. (2002) Habitat manipulation in lucerne *Medicago sativa*: arthropod population dynamics in harvested and 'refuge' crop strips. *Journal of Applied Ecology*, 39, 445-454.

Juncker, J.C. (2019) Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 2019/677 of 29 April 2019 concerning the non-renewal of the approval of the active substance chlorothalonil, in accordance with Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009 of the European Parliament and of the Council concerning the placing of plant protection products on the market, and amending Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No 540/2011 (Text with EEA relevance). C/2019/3054. (ed. O.J.O.T.E. Unions), p. L 114/15. Document 32019R0677, Brussels.

Khan, K. and Verma, R.K. (2018) Diversifying cropping systems with aromatic crops for better productivity and profitability in subtropical north Indian plains. *Industrial Crops and Products*, 115, 104-110.

Kuznetsova, A., Brockhoff, P.B. and Christensen, R.H.B. (2017) *lmerTest* package: tests in linear mixed effects models. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 82, 1-26.

Landis, D.A., Wratten, S.D. and Gurr, G.M. (2000) Habitat management to conserve natural enemies of arthropod pests in agriculture. *Annual Review of Entomology*, 45, 175-201.

Lassau, S.A., Hochuli, D.F., Cassis, G. and Reid, C.A.M. (2005) Effects of habitat complexity on forest beetle diversity: do functional groups respond consistently? *Diversity and Distributions*, 11, 73-82.

Lenth, R.V. (2016) Least-Squares means: the R package *lsmeans*. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 69, 1-33.

Li, Z.H., Song, B., Zhao, Q.H. and Ding, S.Y. (2016a) Effects of multi-scale landscape heterogeneity on soil meso- and microfaunal communities in typical regions of the lower reaches of the Yellow River. *Acta Ecologica Sinica*, 36, 448-455.

- 508 Li, H.L., Guo, J.X., Zhang, H., Wang, D.F., Wang, Q.S., Zeng, M.S. *et al.* (2016b) The effects
509 of intercropping different green manure plants on the structure and diversity of arthropod
510 communities in tea plantations. *Chinese Journal of Applied Entomology*, 53, 545-553 (in
511 Chinese).
- 512 Marshall, G.A.K. (1938) Three new injurious Curculionidae (Col.). *Bulletin of Entomological*
513 *Research*, 29, 211-213.
- 514 Marshall, G.A.K. (2009) New injurious Curculionidae (Col.). *Bulletin of Entomological*
515 *Research*, 18, 257-266.
- 516 Muraleedharan, N. (1992) Pest control in Asia. *Tea: cultivation to consumption*. (eds. K.C.
517 Willson & M.N. Cliffords), pp. 375-412. Springer Netherlands, Dordrecht.
- 518 Muraleedharan, N. and Chen, Z.M. (1997) Pests and diseases of tea and their management.
519 *Journal of Plantation Crops*, 25, 15-43.
- 520 Nicholls, C.I. and Altieri, M.A. (2013) Plant biodiversity enhances bees and other insect
521 pollinators in agroecosystems. A review. *Agronomy for Sustainable Development*, 33,
522 257-274.
- 523 Oksanen, J., Blanchet, F.G., Friendly, M., Kindt, R., Legendre, P., Mcglinn, D. *et al.* (2019)
524 Vegan: community ecology package. *R package version 2.5-6*.
525 <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=vegan>.
- 526 Pang, X.F. and Mao, J.L. (1979) Economic insect fauna of China, Fasc. 14, Coleoptera:
527 Coccinellidae (II). Science Press, Beijing, China (in Chinese).
- 528 Pappas, M.L., Broekgaarden, C., Broufas, G.D., Kant, M.R., Messelink, G.J., Steppuhn, A. *et*
529 *al.* (2017) Induced plant defences in biological control of arthropod pests: a double-edged
530 sword. *Pest Management Science*, 73, 1780-1788.
- 531 Perumalsamy, K., Selvasundaram, R., Roobakkumar, A., Rahman, V.J., Babu, A. and
532 Muraleedharan, N.N. (2009) Life table and predation of *Oligota pygmaea* (Coleoptera:

533 Staphylinidae) a major predator of the red spider mite, *Oligonychus coffeae* (Acarina:
534 Tetranychidae) infesting tea. *Biological Control*, 51, 96-101.

535 Perumalsamy, K., Selvasundaram, R., Roobakkumar, A., Rahman, V.J. and Muraleedharan, N.
536 (2010) Life table and predatory efficiency of *Stethorus gilvifrons* (Coleoptera:
537 Coccinellidae), an important predator of the red spider mite, *Oligonychus coffeae* (Acari:
538 Tetranychidae), infesting tea. *Experimental and Applied Acarology*, 50, 141-50.

539 Qi, S.C., Huang, B.K., Xu, D.Y. and Sun, J.D. (1993) A list of tea pests in Fujian province
540 (continued). *Entomological Journal of East China*, 2, 24-35.

541 R Development Core Team (2019) R: a language and environment for statistical computing. *R*
542 *Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. URL <https://www.R-project.org/>.*

543 Ren, G.D., Ba, Y.B. and Liu, H.Y. (2016) Fauna Sinica, Insecta, Vol. 63, Coleoptera:
544 Tenebrionidae (I), Science Press, Beijing, China (in Chinese).

545 Rivers, A., Voortman, C. and Barbercheck, M. (2020) Cover crops support arthropod predator
546 activity with variable effects on crop damage during transition to organic management.
547 *Biological Control*, 151, 104377.

548 Rosenzweig, M.L. (1995) Species diversity in space and time. Cambridge Univ Press,
549 Cambridge, UK. 436pp.

550 Roy, S., Mukhopadhyay, A., Das, S. and Gurusubramanian, G. (2010) Bioefficacy of
551 coccinellid predators on major tea pests. *Journal of Biopesticides*, 3, 33-36.

552 Sahoo, D.C., Madhu, M.G., Bosu, S.S. and Khola, O.P.S. (2016) Farming methods impact on
553 soil and water conservation efficiency under tea [*Camellia sinensis* (L.)] plantation in
554 Nilgiris of South India. *International Soil and Water Conservation Research*, 4, 195-198.

555 Sarkar, N.G. and Hajra, A.G. (1994) Environmental impact of pesticides and alternatives of
556 pest control in tea. APRC Monograph. Assam Review Publishing Co., Calcutta, India.

557 Schipanski, M.E., Barbercheck, M., Douglas, M.R., Finney, D.M., Haider, K., Kaye, J.P. *et al.*

558 (2014a) A framework for evaluating ecosystem services provided by cover crops in
559 agroecosystems. *Agricultural Systems*, 125, 12-22.

560 Schipanski, M.E., Barbercheck, M., Douglas, M.R., Finney, D.M., Haider, K., Kaye, J.P. *et al.*
561 (2014b) A framework for evaluating ecosystem services provided by cover crops in
562 agroecosystems. *Agricultural Systems*, 125, 12-22.

563 Schmidt, J.M. and Rypstra, A.L. (2010) Opportunistic predator prefers habitat complexity that
564 exposes prey while reducing cannibalism and intraguild encounters. *Oecologia*, 164,
565 899-910.

566 Shiao, S.N. (1977) Bionomics of the camellia scale, *Pseudaonidia duplex* (Cockerell), in
567 northern parts of Taiwan. I. Life history and mortality factors. *Plant Protection Bulletin*,
568 *Taiwan*, 19, 65-77.

569 Snyder, W.E., Snyder, G.B., Finke, D.L. and Straub, C.S. (2006) Predator biodiversity
570 strengthens herbivore suppression. *Ecology Letters*, 9, 789-796.

571 Solem, J.O. and Gullefors, B. (1997) Trichoptera, Caddisflies. *Aquatic insects of North Europe*.
572 (ed. A.N. Nilssons), pp. 223-255. Apollo Books Aps., Stenstrup, Denmark.

573 Song, T.Q., Wang, K.L., Peng, W.X., Wang, J.R., Xiao, R.L., Zeng, F.P. *et al.* (2006) Ecological
574 effects of intercropping white clover on tea plantation in a subtropical hilly region. *Acta*
575 *Ecologica Sinica*, 26, 3647-3655 (in Chinese).

576 Sudoi, V., Khaemba, B.M. and Wanjala, F.M.E. (1996) Influence of soil applied nitrogen
577 (NPKS 25: 5: 5:5) on *Brevipalpus phoenicis* Geijskes (Acari: Tenuipalpidae) mite incidence
578 and damage symptoms on tea. *Annals of Applied Biology*, 128, 13-19.

579 Trichard, A., Ricci, B., Ducourtieux, C. and Petit, S. (2014) The spatio-temporal distribution of
580 weed seed predation differs between conservation agriculture and conventional tillage.
581 *Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment*, 188, 40-47.

582 Walgama, R.S. and Pallemulla, R.M.D.T. (2005) The distribution of shot hole borer, *Xyleborus*

583 *fornicatus* Eichh. (Coleoptera: Scolytidae), across tea growing areas in Sri Lanka: a
584 reassessment. *Sri Lanka Journal of Tea Science*, 70, 105-120.

585 Walgama, R.S. and Zalucki, M.P. (2007) Temperature-dependent development of *Xyleborus*
586 *fornicatus* (Coleoptera: Scolytidae), the shot-hole borer of tea in Sri Lanka: implications for
587 distribution and abundance. *Insect Science*, 14, 301-308.

588 Wang, G.H., Liang, Y.F., Tian, Y.H., Wang, J.L. and Zhou, G.L. (2004) Effect of chemical
589 insecticides on the diversity of arthropods in tea garden. *Journal of Tea Science*, 24, 99-104
590 (in Chinese).

591 Wang, Y.P., Chen, X.X. and He, J.H. (2001a) Studies of natural enemy found on tea tree from
592 Zhejiang. *Journal of Zhejiang Forestry Science and Technology*, 21, 38-40 (in Chinese).

593 Wang, Y.P., Chen, X.X. and He, J.H. (2001b) Studies on natural enemies of *Aleurocanthus*
594 *spiniferus* on tea garden in Zhejiang. *Natural Enemies of Insects*, 162-165 (in Chinese).

595 Wei, W., Kong, Y., Zhang, Y.P., Wang, M.C., Li, Z.R. and Yao, Y.C. (2010) The relationship
596 among aphids and natural enemies in the different aromatic plants intercropping plots of
597 pear orchard. *Acta Ecologica Sinica*, 30, 2899-2908 (in Chinese)

598 Wu, Z.D., You, Z.M., Jiang, F.Y., Wang, F., Zhu, L.G. and Weng, B.Q. (2013) Effects of
599 inter-row green manure mulching on soil physical and chemical properties of young tea
600 plantations. *Fujian Journal of Agricultural Sciences*, 28, 1285-1290 (in Chinese).

601 Yang, D.R., Chen, C.J., Liu, H.Z. and Liu, G.H. (1999) Community structure and ecological
602 distribution of tea insect pests in south and west part of Yunnan province. *Southwest China*
603 *Journal of Agricultural Sciences*, 12, 90-96 (in Chinese).

604 Ye, H.X., Cui, L., He, X.M. and Han, B.Y. (2010) Effect of intercropping tea with citrus,
605 waxberry, or snake gourd on population density and spatial distribution of the tea green
606 leafhopper and araneids. *Acta Ecologica Sinica*, 30, 6019-6026 (in Chinese).

607 Zhan, J., Li, Z.W., Deng, S.F. and Ying, Z.Y. (2018) Preliminary variations in the environment

608 of tea gardens and tea growth on the tea-grass interaction mode. *Pratacultural Science*, 35,
609 2694-2703 (in Chinese).

610 Zhang, H.H. and Tan, J.C. (2004) *Non-pollution* control of tea pests in China. Anhui Science
611 and Technology Press, Hefei, China. 292 pp (in Chinese).

612 Zhang, R.J. (2016) The effect of *Harmonia axyridis* (Pallas) on control of sucking pests in tea
613 plantations. MSc Thesis, Guizhou University, Guiyang, China. 57 pp (in Chinese).

614 Zhang, W.W. and Li, Y.S. (2011) Chinese Insects Illustrated, Chongqing University Press,
615 Chongqing, China. 691 pp (in Chinese).

616 Zhang, X.L., Li, Y.C., Wang, Y.Y., Cai, H.Y., Zeng, H. and Wang, Z.H. (2019) Influence of
617 future climate change in suitable habitats of tea in different countries. *Biodiversity Science*,
618 27, 595-606 (in Chinese).

619 Zhang, Z.Q., Luo, Z.X., Gao, Y., Bian, L., Sun, X.L. and Chen, Z.M. (2014a) Volatiles from
620 non-host aromatic plants repel tea green leafhopper *Empoasca vitis*. *Entomologia*
621 *Experimentalis et Applicata*, 153, 156-169.

622 Zhang, Z.Q., Sun, X.L., Luo, Z.X., Bian, L. and Chen, Z.M. (2014b) Dual action of *Catsia tora*
623 in tea plantations: repellent volatiles and augmented natural enemy population provide
624 control of tea green leafhopper. *Phytoparasitica*, 42, 595-607.

625 Zhao, S.X., Zeng, Z.H. and Wu, G.Y. (2001) Predation of *Cryptolaemus montrouzieri* and
626 *Pharoscymnus taoi* to *Aspidiotus destructor*. *Entomological Journal of East China*, 10,
627 72-76 (in Chinese).

628 Zhao, Z.H., Reddy, G.V.P., Hui, C. and Li, B.L. (2016) Approaches and mechanisms for
629 ecologically based pest management across multiple scales. *Agriculture, Ecosystems and*
630 *Environment*, 230, 199-209.

631 Zintzen, V., Norro, A., Massin, C. and Mallefet, J. (2008) Temporal variation of *Tubularia*
632 *indivisa* (Cnidaria, Tubulariidae) and associated epizoites on artificial habitat communities

633 in the North Sea. *Marine Biology*, 153, 405-420.

634

635

Supplementary information

Supplementary material 1 List of full species names, families they belong to, their feeding guild categorization, and abbreviations used.

Supplementary material 2 All model statistics and pairwise least-square means comparisons from the repeated measures linear mixed effect models (LMER). Pas: sown *Paspalum notatum*; Cas: sown *Chamaecrista rotundifolia*; Bar: bare ground; Nat: natural ground cover.

Supplementary material 3 Boxplot comparisons of abundance-related measures for each sampling date. (A) shows total log-abundance, (B) herbivore log-abundance, (C) predator log-abundance, and (D) predator:herbivore log-abundance ratios Pas: sown *Paspalum notatum*; Cas: sown *Chamaecrista rotundifolia*; Bar: bare ground; Nat: natural ground cover.

Supplementary material 4 Boxplot comparisons of biomass-related measures for each sampling date. (A) shows total log-biomass, (B) herbivore log-biomass, (C) predator log-biomass, and (D) predator:herbivore log-biomass ratios. Pas: sown *Paspalum notatum*; Cas: sown *Chamaecrista rotundifolia*; Bar: bare ground; Nat: natural ground cover.

Supplementary material 5 Boxplot comparisons of richness-related measures for each sampling date. (A) shows total species richness, (B) herbivore species richness, (C) predator species richness, and (D) predator:herbivore species richness ratios. Pas: sown *Paspalum notatum*; Cas: sown *Chamaecrista rotundifolia*; Bar: bare ground; Nat: natural ground cover.

A **B** **C** **D**

A **B** **C** **D**

A **B** **C** **D**

A **D** **B** **E** **C** **F**