

1  
2

3

4

## 5

6

---

\*Corresponding Author

*Email addresses:* [samuel.robinson@ucalgary.ca](mailto:samuel.robinson@ucalgary.ca) (Samuel V. J. Robinson), [hoanglan.nguyen@ucalgary.ca](mailto:hoanglan.nguyen@ucalgary.ca) (Lan H. Nguyen), [paul.galpern@ucalgary.ca](mailto:paul.galpern@ucalgary.ca) (Paul Galpern)

## 1. Introduction

Intensive agricultural production has increased over the last 100 years – both in terms of area and intensity, such as enhanced tillage or the addition of synthetic fertilizers and pesticides – and agricultural land now makes up over a third of ice-free land on Earth (Ramankutty *et al.* 2018). This has allowed increases in human population and increased global stability in production (Foley *et al.* 2011). However, this is not without cost, as higher-diversity non-crops are converted to lower-diversity crops, resulting in loss of habitat and overall biodiversity of non-target organisms. Maintaining both biodiversity and production in agroecosystems represents a goal of conservationists and agronomists, and holds the potential for win-win scenarios (“multifunctionality” *sensu* Mitchell *et al.* 2014; Frei *et al.* 2018; but see also Karp *et al.* 2018). Key to this goal is the preservation of semi-natural land (SNL) in and around crops, which represents the interface between crops and non-crops within agroecosystems.

SNL in agroecosystems is important for both agricultural production and conservation (Prieto-Benítez & Méndez 2011), and can create better biotic and abiotic conditions for crop growth (Case *et al.* 2019; Weninger *et al.* 2021; but see Lowe *et al.* 2021). SNL acts as habitat for mobile organisms, and can act as a source of ecosystem services, such as pollination or pest control (Albrecht *et al.* 2020; Gardner *et al.* 2021), but this depends on both the crop system (Gray & Lewis 2014; Quinn *et al.* 2017) and landscape context (Marja *et al.* 2019; Boetzel *et al.* 2020). SNL can also create microclimate effects that reduce extreme temperature, trap moisture, and reduce wind speed and soil erosion (Kort 1988; Brandle *et al.* 2004; Wratten *et al.* 2012). Field boundaries (e.g. grass and flower strips, tree or shrub shelterbelts, road right-of-ways) are SNL of particular interest, as they are extremely common and require less land than larger agricultural set-asides.

Semi-natural field boundaries may cause positive or negative effects on crops, depending on the spatial scale at which ecosystem services operate. Low yields near may occur near the edge of the field because of patchy seed emergence, poor microclimate, shading from trees, soil compaction, or patchy herbicide application leading to higher weed competition (Figure 1, Scenario 2). Alternatively, yield may be higher near field boundaries (Scenario 3) if boundaries provide helpful ecosystem services (Duelli & Obrist 2003). For example, crop pollination services from bees that nest in field boundaries drops rapidly with distance (Garibaldi *et al.* 2011) and wind speed is reduced directly downwind of treelines (de Jong & Kowalchuk 1995), so positive effects will be concentrated close to the boundary. Depending on the rate at which positive and negative boundary effects decline with distance, another scenario is also possible. Yield may be maximized at intermediate distances (Scenario 4), suggesting a

“Goldilocks” field size where negative edge effects are canceled out by ecosystem services (Kowalchuk & de Jong 1995; Helmers & Brandle 2005; Mitchell *et al.* 2014; Pywell *et al.* 2015; Van Vooren *et al.* 2017).

Unfortunately, data to inform these decisions are often minimal, as observing boundary effects requires large amounts of expensive and time-consuming crop yield data. This means that studies of SNL effects on crop yield tend to suffer from limited spatial scope and small sample sizes, reducing statistical power and generality (Brandle *et al.* 1984; Baker *et al.* 2018; but see also Redhead *et al.* 2020). Meta-analyses are a common solution to this problem (e.g. Albrecht *et al.* 2020; Lowe *et al.* 2021), but precision yield data holds enormous promise because of its relatively common usage and low operating costs (Steel 2017; Pywell *et al.* 2015; Osorio *et al.* 2018). However, its use is limited for several reasons, namely 1) a lack of standardized formats between equipment types, 2) sensor calibration required for field-level accuracy, and 3) low familiarity with spatial statistical methods. Ecosystem services from field boundaries may influence both the mean as well as the variability of yield in agroecosystems (Redhead *et al.* 2020; Hünicken *et al.* 2021); typically only means are considered, but lower variability in yield can also be valuable from a grower’s perspective. There are few studies of yield variability (only those with large datasets), but precision yield data opens up the possibility of modeling within-field variability, as well as average yield.

Within the Canadian prairie provinces, Alberta has roughly 58300 km<sup>2</sup> of cultivated agriculture (excluding pasture), of which the majority is spring wheat (*Triticum aestivum*), canola (*Brassica napus*), barley (*Hordeum vulgare*), and peas (*Pisum sativum*) (36.6%, 30.8%, 17.1%, and 7.0% in 2020, respectively; Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada 2022). Roughly 85% of growers in western Canada report having precision yield monitoring capability (Steel 2017), but these data are seldom used to answer large-scale agroecological questions. In this paper we use a precision yield dataset from Alberta to ask the following questions: 1. How does crop yield change with distance from the edge of field? 2. Does this depend on type of field edge? 3. Is there an intermediate distance where yield is maximized or variance is minimized? To our knowledge, only Pywell *et al.* (2015) and Osorio *et al.* (2018) have studied the effects of field boundaries using precision yield data, making this study one of the first of its kind, and even more so within a Canadian context.

## 2. Methods

### 2.1. Data collection

Precision yield data were collected directly from farmers across Alberta (Figure S1). Farmers were solicited for yield data through local agronomists, and we received data from 4 individual growers and 1 agronomist with 87 individual fields across 7 years (2014-2020), for a total of 298 field-years of data. Raw data were converted to csv format using Ag Leader SMS®. 85% of the crop types were either wheat, canola, or peas, three of the most common crops in rotation in Alberta (Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada 2022). Crop rotations in Alberta usually consist of a combination of wheat → canola → pulses → barley, with other crops being included dependent on the regional growing conditions (e.g. sunflowers, flax, corn). The remaining crop types had low replication, so we constrained our analysis to only field-years containing wheat (94), canola (119), or peas (39), for a total of 252 field-years of data. Individual fields ranged from 5.9 to 369 ha in area (mean: 72.2 ha), and contained between 1 and 6 years of data (mean: 3.1), for a total of 14.4 million data points.

Yield data was collected in rectangles of the same length as the data interval (distance = combine ground speed × interval, typically 1 second) and the same width as the combine header (5-7 m, adjusted by the combine to account for overlap with adjacent swaths). We used dry yield (tonnes of seed per hectare minus crop moisture) as our measure of yield, using the area of each rectangle (m<sup>2</sup>), dry yield (tonnes), and the spatial location. Because of the large number of yield rectangles per field (30-800 thousand), we used the centroid of each polygon as its location, treating areal data as point data. Fields were all conventional (standard herbicide and fungicide application), and seeding and application rates were constant within fields, so we did not consider these inputs in our analysis. Precision yield data can be highly variable and is prone to extreme outliers, especially when ground speeds are low, during turning on headlands, or when the combine is changing speed (Arslan & Colvin 2002; Griffin *et al.* 2007; Whelan & Taylor 2013). Recording data between different fields can also cause extreme “jumps” in location, and we verified that all the data points were located within the given field boundaries. Therefore, we used the following filtering procedure to clean the data prior to model fitting (see Appendix B for R code):

1. Removed outliers and “inliers” using the spatial filtering procedure from Vega *et al.* (2019)
2. Removed unrealistic high yield values (10.75 t/ha for wheat, 8 t/ha for canola and peas), and values  $\leq$  zero

3. Removed extremely low and high outliers (below 1st percentile, above 99th percentile) for: dry yield, steering angle differences, ground speed
4. Removed points with large changes ( $>20\%$ ) in ground speed
5. Removed extremely low and high changes in position, indicating that the combine had stopped or moved to another part of the field between data collection
6. Sub-sampled filtered data to 50,000 data points per field (reduce computation time)

Field boundaries were digitized using buffers from the yield data locations, then manually checked using satellite imagery from Google Earth and classified land cover data. Edge location and type were usually clearly visible from the Google Earth imagery (CNES/Airbus imagery, 1.5 m resolution), but if they were ambiguous we used classified Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada (2022, 30 m resolution) data to confirm the land cover types surrounding each field. The location of a given crop edge is flexible and can change yearly, depending on planting and emergence conditions. For example, ephemeral wetlands are flooded during some years, but consist mainly of grasses during dry years, and grass boundaries can change if fields are used for as haying or pasture during crop rotation. This makes consistent classification of field boundaries difficult, but we used the following general categories for field boundaries:

1. Standard: grassy field edge, staging yard, or road right-of-way (grassy strip typically 5-10 m wide)
2. Wetland: permanent wetland; borders are largely unchanged from year-to-year
3. Shelterbelt: permanent windbreaks, shelterbelts, remnant forests, or shrublands
4. Other crop: annual crop or pasture with little or no visible boundary between planted areas
5. Bare: unplanted, fallow, flooded area, temporary wetland (only present for a single season), staging yard, oil and gas equipment, or road without a planted boundary
6. Grassland: permanent seminatural grassland or pasture (not in rotation)

## *2.2. Analysis*

Yield data from each field contains both random and systematic errors that must be modeled in order to reveal underlying changes in yield. Crop yield can vary within a field due to soil conditions, moisture, seeding rates, herbicide application, previous agricultural practices, and other factors not directly related to boundary distance. To account for this, we used additive models of the effect of boundary distance on crop yield while accounting for within-field spatial variation.

We fit the following model to each field-year of data:

$$\begin{aligned}
\sqrt{Yield} &\sim Normal(\mu, \sigma) \\
\mu &= Intercept + f(\text{Boundary Distance}, b = 5)_i + \\
&\quad f(\text{Easting, Northing}, b = 80) \\
\log(\sigma) &= Intercept + f(\text{Boundary Distance}, b = 5)_i + \\
&\quad f(\text{Easting, Northing}, b = 80)
\end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

• where:

1. Yield = weight of crop gathered per area of harvest (t/ha)
2. Boundary Distance = distance from field boundary type  $i$  (m)
3. Easting, Northing = distance from centre of field (m)
4.  $f(x, b)$  = penalized thin-plate regression spline, where  $x$  is the predictor and  $b$  is the number of basis dimensions

In addition to modeling edge effects (our variable of interest), this model also accounts for within-field spatial variation not related to edges. Spatiotemporal variation can also be modelled using a Gaussian Process Model (e.g. Kriging, SPDE approximations) but this was computationally unfeasible with 50,000 data points per field. Penalized splines offer a compromise, as they account for nonlinear relationships in the same way as Gaussian processes using a reduced number of dimensions. We used 5 basis dimensions for the distance smoother and 80 for the spatial smoothers, as we hypothesized that the functional form of boundary effects would not be as complex as within-field variation (as in Figure 1). All models were fit in *R* using the *mgcv* library (version 1.8.38, Wood 2017), and figures were created with *ggplot2* and *ggpubr* (versions 3.3.5, Wickham 2016; and 0.4.0, Kassambara 2020).

The residuals in most of the models displayed both spatial autocorrelation in the residuals, indicating “micro-scale” variation that was not captured by the spatial smoothers (Cressie & Wikle 2011; Wikle *et al.* 2019). This is extremely common in precision yield data, and can bias standard errors of regression terms, but because a) there were a large number of data points per field, b) standard errors were relatively small (i.e. extremely small p-values), and c) results did not change with the addition of more basis functions (120 rather than 80), we decided to leave the models as-is. Temporal autocorrelation in residuals was also present, but we did not include temporal smoothers because spatial and temporal processes are confounded in precision yield data. That is, combining of fields occurs in patterns (e.g.

east-to-west) so we cannot tell whether changes in yield in certain areas of the field were caused by deviations in the yield monitor sensors over time, or whether they represent changes in growing conditions. We considered the latter to be a more realistic assumption, so we assigned all random variation as spatial in nature. Non-standard combine driving patterns may be able to gather data in a way that can detect sensor drift, but this is beyond the scope of this research.

To consider results from all field-level models together, we fit models of each field-year independently and then fit overall smoothers as averages of the field-level smoothers. This does not account for uncertainty in the field-level smoothers, so we used an approach similar to bootstrapping:

1. Extract single posterior sample (*rnorm* in R) of smoother parameters from each field-level model using coefficient estimates and standard errors.
2. Use posterior sample to simulate a new smoother from each field.
3. Fit new model of simulated smoothers from all fields (with a field-year random intercept), and save this “meta-smoother.”
4. Repeat 500 times, and calculate coverage intervals (5-95% percentiles) on saved meta-smoothers.

This gives coverage intervals (CIs) for the “average” smoother while accounting for field-level variability, and is conceptually similar to a meta-analysis. Spatial variability was not averaged between fields because within-field variability is not directly comparable between fields.

### 3. Results

#### 3.1. Field-level example

The filtered data from each field contained a large amount of variation, but the non-stationary additive models were able to reveal underlying yield patterns. To illustrate this, we show the results from a single wheat field, where we show the relative impact of boundary distance and spatial variation on both yield mean and yield SD (“patchiness”). Figure 2a shows the filtered data collected from a single field, demonstrating a large amount of variation even after filtering. Yield mean tended to increase with distance from field boundaries while yield SD tended to decrease, but there were no consistent differences between boundary types (Figure 3). Finally, the random spatial smoothers in Figures 2b and 2c show that yield mean and SD systematically vary within fields, likely due to moisture, elevation, or soil conditions.

### 177 3.2. Overall results

178 Across all fields, standard field boundaries (grassy borders) were the most common boundary type,  
 179 followed by shelterbelts and other crops (Figure S2). Overall, both yield average and yield variability  
 180 were extremely spatially dependent across all fields (average p-values both  $<0.0001$ ), meaning that  
 181 within-field variation was the primary driver of yield across canola, wheat, and pea crops (Table 1, row  
 182 6). Distances from boundaries were also important, but a lower proportion of the fields had strong  
 183 effects (rows 1-5, cols 3 + 5).

184 Average canola yield tended to increase with distance from all crop boundaries, starting at 2.5  
 185 t/ha at the field edge and leveling off at about 3 t/ha (Figure 4 top row). Shelterbelt and standard  
 186 boundaries were well-represented in the data, and average yield quickly increased with distance away  
 187 from the field boundary, but shelterbelts had a small intermediate maximum at around 50 m before a  
 188 weak decrease with distance, while average yield away from Standard field boundaries plateaued at 50  
 189 m and remained roughly constant with distance. The effect of other boundary types was less consistent,  
 190 but average yield tended to increase with distance away from grassland, other crop, and wetland, and  
 191 was roughly the same with distance from bare boundary types. Yield variability (Figure 4 bottom row)  
 192 was essentially constant with distance for shelterbelt, standard, and other crop field boundaries, but  
 193 showed some evidence of decreasing with distance from field boundary at wetlands, bare, and grassland.  
 194 Interestingly, there was an intermediate reduction in canola yield variability at about 75 m away from  
 195 wetland boundaries, indicating a potential stabilizing effect, but this was offset by the large increase in  
 196 yield variability at the edge of wetlands.

197 The effect of boundary distance on average wheat yield was much more variable than the patterns  
 198 seen in canola yield. Average yield (Figure 5, top row) roughly increased with distance away from  
 199 wetland, standard, and grasslands, but both shelterbelts and bare ground displayed an intermediate  
 200 maximum at around 50 m (similar to canola), and decreased slightly with distance from Other Crops.  
 201 Yield variability, on the other hand, tended to decrease with distance from bare, grassland, and wetland  
 202 (before 100 m, at least), increased slightly with distance from shelterbelt and standard boundaries, and  
 203 was roughly constant with distance from other crops (Figure 5, bottom row).

204 Pea crops were less well-represented in our data ( $N = 39$  fields), and therefore the effects of  
 205 boundaries tended to be less consistent. Average pea yields (Figure 6, top row) were roughly 4.25  
 206 t/ha at the field boundary and increased to just below 5 t/ha away from shelterbelt, standard, and  
 207 other crop boundaries, while the effect of bare, grassland, and wetland boundaries was inconsistent.



208 Conversely, yield variability (Figure 6, bottom row) decreased with distance from grassland, shelterbelt,  
209 standard, and wetland boundaries, while the pattern with distance from other crop and bare was  
210 inconsistent. Unlike canola and wheat crops, there was no obvious evidence of an intermediate increase  
211 in yield with distance from the field boundary.

## 212 4. Discussion

213 Within individual fields, both the average and variability of yield changed with distance from the  
214 field boundary, and there were strong spatial relationships within each field, likely related to underlying  
215 soil or moisture conditions. Mean yield tended to increase with distance from field boundaries before  
216 plateauing, which was not surprising; however, we also found evidence of intermediate boosts in yield  
217 from shelterbelts next to canola and wheat. However, this intermediate increase was small in canola  
218 crops, meaning that ecosystem services likely did not vary strongly with distance from field boundaries  
219 (Scenario 2, Figure 1). There was a fairly large (0.75 t/ha) intermediate increase in average wheat yields  
220 away from shelterbelts, indicating a potential reduction in ecosystem services with distance. However,  
221 there was a similar (albeit weaker) pattern associated with bare ground, so this pattern may be caused  
222 by something other than the presence of shelterbelts. This indicates that shelterbelts may have a  
223 positive effect on wheat yields (and possibly other crops not considered in this study), and future work  
224 should expand this within relevant geographic sub-regions in order to locally inform growers about how  
225 best to manage the landscapes surrounding their fields. Furthermore, our work shows that precision  
226 yield data can be used to address large-scale agroecological questions, and we recommend its general  
227 adoption for the study of agriculture and agroecology.

228 Our analysis showed decreased yield at the field edge – this is a very common pattern that growers  
229 and agronomists are familiar with – but we also identified an intermediate increase in wheat yield  
230 with distance from shelterbelts and bare ground. We hypothesize that the potential causes of this  
231 intermediate yield “boost” may be microclimate effects, soil effects, or beneficial animal spillover.  
232 Shelterbelts can act to capture snow and moderate downwind microclimate, reducing water stress on  
233 crop plants and increasing yield (Staple & Lehane 1955; Kowalchuk & de Jong 1995; Bao *et al.* 2012).  
234 However, Kowalchuk & de Jong (1995) found that positive microclimate effects of shelterbelts on wheat  
235 yield occur at around 20 m (3-4 times the shelterbelt height), while our work shows a peak at around 50  
236 m. This is also complicated by the fact that water stress varies from year-to-year, and that the impact  
237 of the shelterbelt also depends on the orientation to prevailing winds and the physical structure of the

shelterbelt (Pelton 1967; Kort 1988; Singh *et al.* 1999). Unexpectedly, we also found this intermediate yield peak near bare field boundaries, indicating that the patterns we found may be at least somewhat related to water stress. While we consider microclimate to be the most likely cause of the intermediate increase, it may also be related to soil effects from shelterbelts, where erosion is reduced and leaf litter from the shelterbelt can cause an increase in soil deposition (de Jong & Kowalchuk 1995). Finally, shelterbelts may also act as sources of predators or parasitoids of wheat crop pests (Dong *et al.* 2015; Ward *et al.* 2021) but their effect depends on pest pressures, which are typically suppressed by pesticide application. We recommend that follow-up studies a) use precision yield data to confirm that this pattern exists across broader geographical areas and b) examine the influence of the three potential mechanisms considered above (as well as their interaction).

Wheat and shelterbelts aside, why did we find few consistent effects of boundary type on crop yield? Our work examined only the first and last links in the causal chain *Field Boundary*  $\rightarrow$  *Ecosystem Service*  $\rightarrow$  *Crop Yield*, meaning that are two mediating relationships where the overall relationship could be broken or obscured. First, field boundaries may not have any influence on beneficial insect abundance if separated from the larger landscape context, or spillover of beneficial organisms may be low. Second, beneficial insect abundance may not influence crop yield if pest pressure or pollination deficits are already low, which may vary among year or location. Abiotic ecosystem services, such as reduced wind speed or temperature, also depend on the structure of the boundary and whether wind or temperature are limiting crop production. Our work suggests that we need to better examine the context in which beneficial organisms spillover from field boundaries, and under what conditions field boundaries provide tangible ecosystem services (Karp *et al.* 2018). We consider these reasons below:

SNL generally has a positive effect on beneficial insect abundance, but field boundaries only represent a fraction of the SNL that surrounds a given field. Our analysis only examined boundary types, without considering the landscape context that fields were embedded in, but some studies show the influence of landscape composition at larger spatial scales (Nguyen *et al.* 2022) which could be particularly important when beneficial arthropods disperse very broadly (Öberg *et al.* 2007). There could also be interactions between landscape composition at different scales (Motzke *et al.* 2016; Haslem *et al.* 2021; Robinson *et al.* 2021), but this is not broadly studied. Landscape complexity and connectivity are also associated with higher abundance of beneficial arthropods (Fahrig *et al.* 2011). This means that field boundaries such as wetlands or shelterbelts may only be helpful if connected to a larger network of non-crop habitat (but see Fahrig *et al.* 2019).

Field boundary characteristics, such as vegetation height or species composition, may play an important role in mediating spillover, but our definitions of boundaries were necessarily loose, as we used satellite imagery to manually classify them. Therefore, it may be that other aspects of field boundaries are more important for spillover of ecosystems services into fields. For example, larger or more functionally diverse hedgerows tend to support more biodiversity than smaller hedgerows (Bonifacio *et al.* 2011; Boughey *et al.* 2011; Lecq *et al.* 2018; Stašiov *et al.* 2020), and some studies have shown that leaf litter and soil compaction influences predatory beetle communities (Sutter *et al.* 2018). These fine-scale boundary characteristics were not measured in our study, but could be used as variables in more biologically-meaningful classifications of field boundaries. Finally, the relevant spatial scale of boundary effects are often related to the height or windward orientation of the shelterbelt (Kort 1988; Kowalchuk & de Jong 1995), and precision yield data has the potential to show this in far greater detail than previous studies.

Our first scenario (Scenario 1, Figure 1) assumes that beneficial organisms disperse from boundaries into the field, and had a generally positive effect on crop yield. However, field boundaries may not have a positive effect if ecosystem dis-services – pest insects or weed seeds – also disperse along with beneficials, or if beneficials do not disperse from the boundary environment. Pests and weeds can also disperse from field boundaries, which may negate any positive effect of ecosystem services (Zhang *et al.* 2007). However, this is still poorly studied, and parsing out services from disservices is impossible using crop yield data *alone*. Ecosystem services from field boundaries may also be limited if beneficial organisms stay in field boundaries, or disperse at wider spatial scales (Öberg *et al.* 2007). Lastly, pest pressure or pollination requirements may be low enough that ecosystem service provision does not significantly change yield. Canola is largely self-pollinating (at least in hybrid canola varieties, Lindström *et al.* 2016) and wheat is wind-pollinated, meaning that slight increases in pollination services may not change yields significantly in either crop (Woodcock *et al.* 2016). Crop pests in most western Canadian fields are suppressed by insecticides (seed-treated or on the crop directly), and insect pest outbreaks tend to be temporally and spatially spotty, meaning spillover of beneficial predators and parasitoids may only matter during outbreak years.

Our work is some of the first to use a large precision yield dataset to answer questions about how landscapes influence yield. Since our sampling represents a limited amount of spatial and temporal coverage, there could be additional confounding variables that obscure signals of yield. Most fields were located in Central Alberta (Dry Mixedwood region, Natural Regions Committee 2006), where

boundaries contained a higher proportion of shelterbelts (Figure S2), but differences from Southern AB (Foothills Fescue and Mixedgrass region) may be confounding the signal. Between-year effects may be important, especially during hot dry years (Kort 1988), but this was not considered in our analysis. Future work could examine whether boundaries have differing effects during hot or cool years, as shading or cooling effects may increase yield during hot years but have no effect (or negative effects) during cooler years. Finally, about 50% of growers in western Canada have collected precision agriculture data, and about 85% have yield monitoring capability (Steel 2017), which means that our work has only scratched the surface of what could be (collectively) one of the richest agroecological datasets ever created. We urge agronomists, growers, and ecologists to adopt more wide-spread use of precision yield data, as it represents a vast source of incredibly detailed information which can be used to answer a variety of important questions.

## 5. Acknowledgements

We thank Trent Clark, Dean Hubbard, Alvin French, and Kristina Polziehn for providing yield data for us, and providing insight on their yield data. We also thank Autumn Barnes of Lethbridge College, Keith Gabert of the Canola Council of Canada, and Laurel Thompson and JP Pettyjohn of Lakeland College for connecting us with farmers and agronomists. Finally, we thank Ben Woodcock and an anonymous second reviewer for their comments on the original manuscript.

## 6. Funding Sources

Funding for this research was provided by Ducks Unlimited Canada’s Institute for Wetland and Waterfowl Research, the Alberta Canola Producers Commission, Manitoba Canola Growers Association, SaskCanola, the Alberta Biodiversity Monitoring Institute, and the Alberta Conservation Association.

## References

- Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada. (2022). *Annual Crop Inventory*. Available at: <https://open.canada.ca/data/en/dataset/ba2645d5-4458-414d-b196-6303ac06c1c9>. Accessed 28 February 2022.
- Albrecht, M., Kleijn, D., Williams, N.M., Tschumi, M., Blaauw, B.R., Bommarco, R., *et al.* (2020). The effectiveness of flower strips and hedgerows on pest control, pollination services and crop yield: A quantitative synthesis. *Ecology Letters*, 23, 1488–1498.

327 Arslan, S. & Colvin, T.S. (2002). An evaluation of the response of yield monitors and combines to  
328 varying yields. *Precision Agriculture*, 3, 107–122.

329 Baker, T.P., Moroni, M.T., Mendham, D.S., Smith, R. & Hunt, M.A. (2018). Impacts of windbreak  
330 shelter on crop and livestock production. *Crop and Pasture Science*, 69, 785.

331 Bao, Y., Li, H. & Zhao, H. (2012). Effect of shelterbelts on winter wheat yields in sanded farmland  
332 of north-western Shandong province, China. *Journal of Food Agriculture & Environment*, 10,  
333 1399–1403.

334 Boetzel, F.A., Schuele, M., Krauss, J. & Steffan-Dewenter, I. (2020). Pest control potential of adjacent  
335 agri-environment schemes varies with crop type and is shaped by landscape context and within-field  
336 position. *Journal of Applied Ecology*, 57, 1482–1493.

337 Bonifacio, R.S., Kinross, C.M., Gurr, G.M. & Nicol, H. (2011). The effect of woody plant diversity and  
338 other stand and landscape factors on the diversity and abundance of birds using farm shelterbelts.  
339 *Pacific Conservation Biology*, 17, 22.

340 Boughey, K.L., Lake, I.R., Haysom, K.A. & Dolman, P.M. (2011). Improving the biodiversity benefits  
341 of hedgerows: How physical characteristics and the proximity of foraging habitat affect the use of  
342 linear features by bats. *Biological Conservation*, 144, 1790–1798.

343 Brandle, J.R., Hodges, L. & Zhou, X.H. (2004). Windbreaks in North American agricultural systems.  
344 In: *New vistas in agroforestry: A compendium for 1st world congress of agroforestry, 2004* (eds.  
345 Nair, P.K.R., Rao, M.R. & Buck, L.E.). Springer Netherlands, Dordrecht, pp. 65–78.

346 Brandle, J.R., Johnson, B.B. & Dearmont, D.D. (1984). Windbreak economics: The case of winter  
347 wheat production in eastern Nebraska. *Journal of Soil and Water Conservation*, 39, 339–343.

348 Case, B.S., Pannell, J.L., Stanley, M.C., Norton, D.A., Brugman, A., Funaki, M., *et al.* (2019).  
349 Non-production vegetation has a positive effect on ecological processes in agroecosystems. *bioRxiv*,  
350 624635.

351 Cressie, N. & Wikle, C.K. (2011). *Statistics for spatio-temporal data*. Wiley.

352 de Jong, E. & Kowalchuk, T.E. (1995). The effect of shelterbelts on erosion and soil properties. *Soil*  
353 *Science*, 159, 337–345.

354 Dong, Z., Ouyang, F., Lu, F. & Ge, F. (2015). Shelterbelts in agricultural landscapes enhance ladybeetle  
355 abundance in spillover from cropland to adjacent habitats. *BioControl*, 60, 351–361.

356 Duelli, P. & Obrist, M.K. (2003). Regional biodiversity in an agricultural landscape: The contribution  
357 of seminatural habitat islands. *Basic and Applied Ecology*, 4, 129–138.

358 Fahrig, L., Arroyo-Rodríguez, V., Bennett, J.R., Boucher-Lalonde, V., Cazetta, E., Currie, D.J., *et al.*  
 359 (2019). Is habitat fragmentation bad for biodiversity? *Biological Conservation*, 230, 179–186.

360 Fahrig, L., Baudry, J., Brotons, L., Burel, F.G., Crist, T.O., Fuller, R.J., *et al.* (2011). Functional  
 361 landscape heterogeneity and animal biodiversity in agricultural landscapes. *Ecology Letters*, 14,  
 362 101–112.

363 Foley, J.A., Ramankutty, N., Brauman, K.A., Cassidy, E.S., Gerber, J.S., Johnston, M., *et al.* (2011).  
 364 Solutions for a cultivated planet. *Nature*, 478, 337–342.

365 Frei, B., Renard, D., Mitchell, M.G.E., Seufert, V., Chaplin-Kramer, R., Rhemtulla, J.M., *et al.*  
 366 (2018). Bright spots in agricultural landscapes: Identifying areas exceeding expectations for  
 367 multifunctionality and biodiversity. *Journal of Applied Ecology*, 55, 2731–2743.

368 Gardner, E., Breeze, T.D., Clough, Y., Smith, H.G., Baldock, K.C.R., Campbell, A., *et al.* (2021).  
 369 Field boundary features can stabilise bee populations and the pollination of mass-flowering crops in  
 370 rotational systems. *Journal of Applied Ecology*, 58, 2287–2304.

371 Garibaldi, L.A., Steffan-Dewenter, I., Kremen, C., Morales, J.M., Bommarco, R., Cunningham, S.A., *et*  
 372 *al.* (2011). Stability of pollination services decreases with isolation from natural areas despite honey  
 373 bee visits. *Ecology Letters*, 14, 1062–1072.

374 Gray, C.L. & Lewis, O.T. (2014). Do riparian forest fragments provide ecosystem services or disservices  
 375 in surrounding oil palm plantations? *Basic and Applied Ecology*, 15, 693–700.

376 Griffin, T.W., Brown, J.P. & Lowenberg-DeBoerc, J. (2007). *Yield monitor data analysis protocol: A*  
 377 *primer in the management and analysis of precision agriculture data*. SSRN.

378 Haslem, A., Clarke, R.H., Holland, G.J., Radford, J.Q., Stewart, A. & Bennett, A.F. (2021). Local  
 379 management or wider context: What determines the value of farm revegetation plantings for birds?  
 380 *Journal of Applied Ecology*.

381 Helmers, G. & Brandle, J.R. (2005). Optimum windbreak spacing in great plains agriculture. *Great*  
 382 *Plains Research*, 15, 179–198.

383 Hünicken, P.L., Morales, C.L., Aizen, M.A., Anderson, G.K.S., García, N. & Garibaldi, L.A. (2021).  
 384 Insect pollination enhances yield stability in two pollinator-dependent crops. *Agriculture, Ecosystems*  
 385 *& Environment*, 320, 107573.

386 Karp, D.S., Chaplin-Kramer, R., Meehan, T.D., Martin, E.A., DeClerck, F., Grab, H., *et al.* (2018).  
 387 Crop pests and predators exhibit inconsistent responses to surrounding landscape composition.  
 388 *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 115, E7863–E7870.

389 Kassambara, A. (2020). *ggpubr: 'ggplot2' based publication ready plots*.

390 Kort, J. (1988). 9. Benefits of windbreaks to field and forage crops. *Agriculture, Ecosystems &*  
391 *Environment*, 22-23, 165–190.

392 Kowalchuk, T.E. & de Jong, E. (1995). Shelterbelts and their effect on crop yield. *Canadian Journal*  
393 *of Soil Science*, 75, 543–550.

394 Lecq, S., Loisel, A., Mullin, S.J. & Bonnet, X. (2018). Manipulating hedgerow quality: Embankment  
395 size influences animal biodiversity in a peri-urban context. *Urban Forestry & Urban Greening*, 35,  
396 1–7.

397 Lindström, S.A.M., Herbertsson, L., Rundlöf, M., Smith, H.G. & Bommarco, R. (2016). Large-scale  
398 pollination experiment demonstrates the importance of insect pollination in winter oilseed rape.  
399 *Oecologia*, 180, 759–769.

400 Lowe, E.B., Groves, R. & Gratton, C. (2021). Impacts of field-edge flower plantings on pollinator con-  
401 servation and ecosystem service delivery – a meta-analysis. *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment*,  
402 310, 107290.

403 Marja, R., Kleijn, D., Tscharnkte, T., Klein, A.-M., Frank, T. & Batáry, P. (2019). Effectiveness of  
404 agri-environmental management on pollinators is moderated more by ecological contrast than by  
405 landscape structure or land-use intensity. *Ecology Letters*, 22, 1493–1500.

406 Mitchell, M.G.E., Bennett, E.M. & Gonzalez, A. (2014). Forest fragments modulate the provision of  
407 multiple ecosystem services. *Journal of Applied Ecology*, 51, 909–918.

408 Motzke, I., Klein, A.-M., Saleh, S., Wanger, T.C. & Tscharnkte, T. (2016). Habitat management  
409 on multiple spatial scales can enhance bee pollination and crop yield in tropical homegardens.  
410 *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment*, 223, 144–151.

411 Natural Regions Committee. (2006). *Natural regions and subregions of Alberta*. Government of Alberta,  
412 Edmonton.

413 Nguyen, L.H., Robinson, S.V.J. & Galpern, P. (2022). Effects of landscape complexity on crop  
414 productivity: An assessment from space. *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment*, 328, 107849.

415 Osorio, R.J., Barden, C.J. & Ciampitti, I.A. (2018). GIS approach to estimate windbreak crop yield  
416 effects in KansasNebraska. *Agroforestry Systems*, 93, 1567–1576.

417 Öberg, S., Ekbom, B. & Bommarco, R. (2007). Influence of habitat type and surrounding landscape on  
418 spider diversity in Swedish agroecosystems. *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment*, 122, 211–219.

419 Pelton, W.L. (1967). The effect of a windbreak on wind travel, evaporation and wheat yield. *Canadian*  
420 *Journal of Plant Science*, 47, 209–214.

421 Prieto-Benítez, S. & Méndez, M. (2011). Effects of land management on the abundance and richness of  
422 spiders (Araneae): A meta-analysis. *Biological Conservation*, 144, 683–691.

423 Pywell, R.F., Heard, M.S., Woodcock, B.A., Hinsley, S., Ridding, L., Nowakowski, M. & Bullock,  
424 J.M. (2015). Wildlife-friendly farming increases crop yield: evidence for ecological intensification.  
425 *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 282, 20151740.

426 Quinn, N.F., Brainard, D.C. & Szendrei, Z. (2017). Floral strips attract beneficial insects but do not  
427 enhance yield in cucumber fields. *Journal of Economic Entomology*, 110, 517–524.

428 Ramankutty, N., Mehrabi, Z., Waha, K., Jarvis, L., Kremen, C., Herrero, M., *et al.* (2018). Trends  
429 in global agricultural land use: Implications for environmental health and food security. *Annual*  
430 *Review of Plant Biology*, 69, 789–815.

431 Redhead, J.W., Oliver, T.H., Woodcock, B.A. & Pywell, R.F. (2020). The influence of landscape  
432 composition and configuration on crop yield resilience. *Journal of Applied Ecology*, 57, 2180–2190.

433 Robinson, S.V.J., Edwards, D., Vickruck, J.L., Best, L.R. & Galpern, P. (2021). Non-crop sources of  
434 beneficial arthropods vary within-season across a prairie agroecosystem. *Agriculture, Ecosystems &*  
435 *Environment*, 320, 107581.

436 Singh, H.P., Kohli, R.K. & Batish, D.R. (1999). Impact of *Populus deltoides* and *Dalbergia sissoo*  
437 shelterbelts on wheat a comparative study. *International Tree Crops Journal*, 10, 51–60.

438 Staple, W.J. & Lehane, J.J. (1955). The influence of field shelterbelts on wind velocity, evaporation,  
439 soil moisture and crop yield. *Canadian Journal of Agricultural Science*, 35, 440–453.

440 Stašiov, S., Diviaková, A., Svitok, M., Novikmec, M. & Dovciak, M. (2020). Hedgerows support rich  
441 communities of harvestmen (Opiliones) in upland agricultural landscape. *Basic and Applied Ecology*,  
442 47, 73–82.

443 Steel, D. (2017). *Analysis of precision agriculture adoption & barriers in western Canada*. Agriculture;  
444 Agri-Food Canada.

445 Sutter, L., Amato, M., Jeanneret, P. & Albrecht, M. (2018). Overwintering of pollen beetles and their  
446 predators in oilseed rape and semi-natural habitats. *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment*, 265,  
447 275–281.

448 Van Vooren, L., Bert, R., Steven, B., Pieter, D.F., Victoria, N., Paul, P., *et al.* (2017). Ecosystem  
449 service delivery of agri-environment measures: A synthesis for hedgerows and grass strips on arable



land. *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment*, 244, 32–51.

Vega, A., Córdoba, M., Castro-Franco, M. & Balzarini, M. (2019). Protocol for automating error removal from yield maps. *Precision Agriculture*, 20, 1030–1044.

Ward, S.E., Umina, P.A., Macfadyen, S. & Hoffmann, A.A. (2021). Hymenopteran parasitoids of aphid pests within Australian grain production landscapes. *Insects*, 12, 44.

Weninger, T., Scheper, S., Lackóová, L., Kitzler, B., Gartner, K., King, N.W., *et al.* (2021). Ecosystem services of tree windbreaks in rural landscapes – a systematic review. *Environmental Research Letters*, 16, 103002.

Whelan, B. & Taylor, J. (2013). *Precision agriculture for grain production systems*. CSIRO Publishing.

Wickham, H. (2016). *ggplot2: Elegant graphics for data analysis*. Springer-Verlag New York.

Wikle, C.K., Zammit-Mangion, A. & Cressie, N. (2019). *Spatio-temporal statistics with r*. Chapman; Hall: CRC Press.

Wood, S.N. (2017). *Generalized additive models: An introduction with R*. CRC press.

Woodcock, B.A., Bullock, J.M., McCracken, M., Chapman, R.E., Ball, S.L., Edwards, M.E., *et al.* (2016). Spill-over of pest control and pollination services into arable crops. *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment*, 231, 15–23.

Wratten, S.D., Gillespie, M., Decourtye, A., Mader, E. & Desneux, N. (2012). Pollinator habitat enhancement: Benefits to other ecosystem services. *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment*, 159, 112–122.

Zamorano, J., Bartomeus, I., Grez, A.A. & Garibaldi, L.A. (2020). Field margin floral enhancements increase pollinator diversity at the field edge but show no consistent spillover into the crop field: A meta-analysis. *Insect Conservation and Diversity*, 13, 519–531.

Zhang, W., Ricketts, T.H., Kremen, C., Carney, K. & Swinton, S.M. (2007). Ecosystem services and dis-services to agriculture. *Ecological Economics*, 64, 253–260.