

## **Effects of Trap Shape, Size, and Color Variations on Capture Rates of Chrysobothris (Coleoptera: Buprestidae) and Related Buprestids**

Authors: Perkovich, Cindy L., Oliver, Jason B., Addesso, Karla M., Basham, Joshua P., and Youssef, Nadeer N.

Source: Florida Entomologist, 106(1) : 63-66

Published By: Florida Entomological Society

URL: <https://doi.org/10.1653/024.106.0111>

---

The BioOne Digital Library (<https://bioone.org/>) provides worldwide distribution for more than 580 journals and eBooks from BioOne's community of over 150 nonprofit societies, research institutions, and university presses in the biological, ecological, and environmental sciences. The BioOne Digital Library encompasses the flagship aggregation BioOne Complete (<https://bioone.org/subscribe>), the BioOne Complete Archive (<https://bioone.org/archive>), and the BioOne eBooks program offerings ESA eBook Collection (<https://bioone.org/esa-ebooks>) and CSIRO Publishing BioSelect Collection (<https://bioone.org/csiro-ebooks>).

Your use of this PDF, the BioOne Digital Library, and all posted and associated content indicates your acceptance of BioOne's Terms of Use, available at [www.bioone.org/terms-of-use](http://www.bioone.org/terms-of-use).

Usage of BioOne Digital Library content is strictly limited to personal, educational, and non-commercial use. Commercial inquiries or rights and permissions requests should be directed to the individual publisher as copyright holder.

---

BioOne is an innovative nonprofit that sees sustainable scholarly publishing as an inherently collaborative enterprise connecting authors, nonprofit publishers, academic institutions, research libraries, and research funders in the common goal of maximizing access to critical research.

# Effects of trap shape, size, and color variations on capture rates of *Chrysobothris* (Coleoptera: Buprestidae) and related buprestids

Cindy L. Perkovich<sup>1</sup>, Jason B. Oliver<sup>1,\*</sup>, Karla M. Addesso<sup>1</sup>, Joshua P. Basham<sup>1</sup>, and Nadeer N. Youssef<sup>1</sup>

Trap design and capture rates for crop pests are pivotal factors in pest management strategies for tree nurseries (LeBude et al. 2012; Frank et al. 2013). Often, traps need to be designed uniquely for the targeted pest (Vinatier et al. 2012; Cavaletto et al. 2020). Trapping methods have been evaluated for some important metallic wood-boring beetle pests (Coleoptera: Buprestidae) such as emerald ash borer, *Agrilus planipennis* Fairmaire (Coleoptera: Buprestidae) (Oliver et al. 2003; LeBude & Adkins 2014; Haack & Petrice 2019), but the genus *Chrysobothris* Eschscholtz (Coleoptera: Buprestidae) is less well studied. *Chrysobothris* are problematic in ornamental tree nurseries on genera such as *Acer* (Sapindaceae), *Cornus* (Cornaceae), and *Malus* (Rosaceae), thus requiring more focused management research (Oliver et al. 2010; Dawadi et al. 2019; Addesso et al. 2020). The objective of this study was to develop suitable traps for buprestid borers commonly found in ornamental tree nurseries. *Chrysobothris* and related buprestids are attracted to purple-colored traps that have a peak reflectance near infrared (~740 nm) (Imrei et al. 2020; Perkovich et al. 2022). To optimize the trap style, the first experiment analyzed trap material, shape, and size. A second experiment further optimized trap design. These trap trials were conducted in 2004 and 2005 with emerald ash borer as the original target for monitoring. Growing concerns about *Chrysobothris* damage in nurseries led to a revisit of these data collections to assess the trap preference of the *Chrysobothris* genus.

A CM2600d spectrophotometer (Konica Minolta Sensing Americas, Inc., Ramsey, New Jersey, USA) was used to determine reflectance characteristics (i.e., lightness [ $L^*$ ], red to green [ $a^*$ ], blue to yellow [ $b^*$ ], and peak reflectance [ $PR$ ]) of traps and trapping materials. Settings for the spectrophotometer were as follows: observer illuminant Daylight 65, observer angle at 10° (CIE 1964 color space), and included specular component SCI and UV at 100% (see Werle et al. 2014 and Perkovich et al. 2022 for further details). Using traps with similar reflectance values and previously demonstrated efficacy for buprestid traps (Perkovich et al. 2022), 12 trap designs were field evaluated for efficiency at capturing *Chrysobothris* and related buprestid species beginning in Apr 2004. Trap designs were made from panels of corrugated plastic (Coroplast, LLC, Vanceburg, Kentucky, USA) or wood and were covered with colored insect glues (Brooks 1919) created by mixing Folkart® 654 (amethyst) or 411 (purple) acrylic violet-like paints (Plaid Enterprises, Inc., Peach Tree Corners, Georgia, USA) into clear Pesticide™ glue (Hummert International, Earth City, Missouri, USA) (mix rate: 1 kg glue per 34 g paint). Glitter glue was made by mixing Poly\*Flake

purple glitter (Glitterex Corp., Cranford, New Jersey, USA) into clear Pesticide™ glue (mix rate: 1 kg glue per 21 g glitter). All traps were placed at ground level. Corrugated plastic panel traps included purple traps 3.8, 15.2, or 30.5 cm wide × 1 m tall (covered with clear unmodified glue), or white traps 3.8 cm wide (covered with clear unmodified, purple glitter, amethyst, or purple glues). The corrugated box trap treatment had four 3.8 cm wide purple panels covered with clear unmodified glue. Tan-colored wooden traps consisted of 1.9 × 3.8 cm posts that were 1 m in height covered with clear unmodified, purple glitter, amethyst, or purple glues (see Table 1 for details of trap design combinations and materials used). Traps were placed in a randomized complete block design using 4 replicates along the edge of a mixed deciduous forest on the Tennessee State University Otis L. Floyd Nursery Research Center in McMinnville, Tennessee, USA. There were 5 m between each block, and each trap treatment was placed 2 m apart. Beetles were collected from traps weekly, cleaned in Histo-Clear™ II (National Diagnostics, Atlanta, Georgia, USA) and 70% ethanol (diluted from 200 proof ethanol, Fisher product #BP2818-4; Fisher Scientific, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, USA), then frozen until identification to species using Downie and Arnette (1995). Species in the *Chrysobothris femorata* (Olivier) (Coleoptera: Buprestidae) complex were identified with revised keys (Wellso & Manley 2007).

In Apr 2005, 7 new trap design treatments were tested based on the 2004 test results. Treatments included: (1) triangular prism traps with 15.2 cm wide panel sides (created by folding a plastic panel to create three 15.2 cm wide sides) with clear glue; (2) 30.5 cm purple plastic panel with clear glue; (3) 15.2 cm purple plastic panel with clear glue; (4) 30.5 cm white plastic panel with purple glue; (5) 3.8 cm wooden stake with clear glue; (6) 3.8 cm wooden stake with purple glue; and (7) a purple plastic box with 3.8 cm wide sides with clear glue. All traps were 1 m tall and placed at ground level. Specimen collection, handling, and identification were conducted as previously described.

The effect of trap design in both the 2004 and 2005 studies were analyzed using generalized linear mixed models. The model included number of individuals (buprestids, *Chrysobothris*, *Chrysobothris* females, and *Chrysobothris* males) collected (as dependent variables) and trap designs (as independent variable) throughout the trapping season (negative binomial distribution). Models were fitted using the “glmer.nb” function in the lme4 (Bates et al. 2017) package in R (R Core Team 2021). Simultaneous pairwise comparisons of trap designs were made using Tukey’s HSD tests. Mean female and male *Chrysobothris*

<sup>1</sup>Tennessee State University, Department of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences, Otis L. Floyd Nursery Research Center, 472 Cadillac Lane, McMinnville, Tennessee 37110, USA

\*Corresponding author; E-mail: joliver@tnstate.edu

Trap features	Mean (+ SE) total trap captures
1. Distance to nearest water	1.00 (0.00)
2. Distance to nearest road	1.00 (0.00)
3. Distance to nearest forest	1.00 (0.00)
4. Distance to nearest field	1.00 (0.00)
5. Distance to nearest house	1.00 (0.00)
6. Distance to nearest stream	1.00 (0.00)
7. Distance to nearest pond	1.00 (0.00)
8. Distance to nearest hill	1.00 (0.00)
9. Distance to nearest valley	1.00 (0.00)
10. Distance to nearest mountain	1.00 (0.00)
11. Distance to nearest lake	1.00 (0.00)
12. Distance to nearest river	1.00 (0.00)
13. Distance to nearest wetland	1.00 (0.00)
14. Distance to nearest meadow	1.00 (0.00)
15. Distance to nearest forest edge	1.00 (0.00)
16. Distance to nearest field edge	1.00 (0.00)
17. Distance to nearest house edge	1.00 (0.00)
18. Distance to nearest stream edge	1.00 (0.00)
19. Distance to nearest pond edge	1.00 (0.00)
20. Distance to nearest hill edge	1.00 (0.00)
21. Distance to nearest valley edge	1.00 (0.00)
22. Distance to nearest mountain edge	1.00 (0.00)
23. Distance to nearest lake edge	1.00 (0.00)
24. Distance to nearest river edge	1.00 (0.00)
25. Distance to nearest wetland edge	1.00 (0.00)
26. Distance to nearest meadow edge	1.00 (0.00)
27. Distance to nearest forest edge	1.00 (0.00)
28. Distance to nearest field edge	1.00 (0.00)
29. Distance to nearest house edge	1.00 (0.00)
30. Distance to nearest stream edge	1.00 (0.00)
31. Distance to nearest pond edge	1.00 (0.00)
32. Distance to nearest hill edge	1.00 (0.00)
33. Distance to nearest valley edge	1.00 (0.00)
34. Distance to nearest mountain edge	1.00 (0.00)
35. Distance to nearest lake edge	1.00 (0.00)
36. Distance to nearest river edge	1.00 (0.00)
37. Distance to nearest wetland edge	1.00 (0.00)
38. Distance to nearest meadow edge	1.00 (0.00)
39. Distance to nearest forest edge	1.00 (0.00)
40. Distance to nearest field edge	1.00 (0.00)
41. Distance to nearest house edge	1.00 (0.00)
42. Distance to nearest stream edge	1.00 (0.00)
43. Distance to nearest pond edge	1.00 (0.00)
44. Distance to nearest hill edge	1.00 (0.00)
45. Distance to nearest valley edge	1.00 (0.00)
46. Distance to nearest mountain edge	1.00 (0.00)
47. Distance to nearest lake edge	1.00 (0.00)
48. Distance to nearest river edge	1.00 (0.00)
49. Distance to nearest wetland edge	1.00 (0.00)
50. Distance to nearest meadow edge	1.00 (0.00)

Material	Width (cm)	Shape	Base color	Glue color <sup>1</sup>	L*	a*	b*	PR (nm)	Chrysobothris <sup>2</sup>			Male Chrysobothris
									Buprestids	Female Chrysobothris <sup>3</sup>		
Plastic	3.8	Box	Purple	Clear	3.09	2.42	-5.76	740	157 ± 3.2 a	142 ± 2.4 a	83 ± 1.9 a*	59 ± 2.4 a
Plastic	15.2	Panel	Purple	Clear	3.09	2.42	-5.76	740	113 ± 3.0 b	82 ± 1.9 b	49 ± 2.1 b*	33 ± 2.0 b
Plastic	3.8	Panel	White	Ameth	16.76	1.02	-1.13	740	113 ± 1.2 b	50 ± 0.7 c	34 ± 0.6 c*	16 ± 1.1 c
Plastic	3.8	Panel	White	Purple	14.03	4.11	-6.14	740	107 ± 2.3 b	67 ± 0.9 c	52 ± 0.7 b*	15 ± 0.5 c
Wood	1.9 × 3.8	Box	Tan	Ameth	7.72	3.68	5.8	740	70 ± 0.8 c	52 ± 0.7 c	39 ± 1.1 c*	13 ± 1.0 c
Wood	1.9 × 3.8	Box	Tan	Purple	12.03	3.32	1.04	740	59 ± 0.7 cd	24 ± 1.4 d	17 ± 1.2 e*	7 ± 1.2 cd
Plastic	3.8	Panel	White	Clear	20.25	0.15	0.09	720	57 ± 0.6 cd	28 ± 0.8 d	17 ± 0.8 e*	11 ± 0.9 c
Plastic	3.8	Panel	White	Glitter	14.62	1.27	-2.43	720	52 ± 1.1 cd	38 ± 1.0 cd	29 ± 1.1 d*	9 ± 1.3 cd
Plastic	3.8	Panel	Purple	Clear	3.09	2.42	-5.76	740	45 ± 1.0 d	31 ± 1.0 cd	20 ± 1.0 d*	11 ± 1.2 c
Wood	1.9 × 3.8	Box	Tan	Glitter	10.45	3.36	-1.03	740	43 ± 1.2 d	52 ± 1.0 c	34 ± 0.8 c*	18 ± 0.9 c
Wood	30.5	Panel	Purple	Clear	3.09	2.42	-5.76	740	40 ± 0.8 d	17 ± 0.9 e	14 ± 0.9 e*	3 ± 1.1 d
Wood	1.9 × 3.8	Box	Tan	Clear	11.49	3.43	10.19	740	10 ± 1.0 e	9 ± 0.8 e	8 ± 0.5 f*	1 ± 0.0 d

The asterisk (\*) in the total female *Chrysobothris* captured column indicates statistically greater captures of females than males on those traps. "a\*" = lightness, "b\*" = red to green, "b\*" = blue to yellow, "pr" = peak reflectance (nm, see text for description). Different letters within columns indicate significant differences between means in a Tukey's HSD test.

caught in each trap type were compared using Welch’s 2-sample *t*-tests.

In 2004, traps that were purple plastic panel boxes with 3.8 cm sides and clear glue captured more buprestids, *Chrysobothris*, *Chrysobothris* females, and *Chrysobothris* males than any other trap ( $X^2_{(51)} = 97.96$ ;  $P = 0.03$ ; Table 1). Overall, all traps caught more *Chrysobothris* females than males ( $t = 1.47$ ;  $P = 0.028$ ; Table 1). In 2005, traps were made with slight alterations of the successful purple plastic panel box design. The purple 15.2 cm plastic panels with clear glue, the purple 3.8 cm plastic panel box with clear glue, and the white 30.5 cm plastic panel with purple glue captured the most buprestid beetles ( $X^2_{(34)} = 93.66$ ;  $P = 0.03$ ). However, the 3.8 cm purple plastic box with clear glue trap had the highest number of catches for *Chrysobothris* (Table 2). Males were caught in lower numbers than females in all traps except for the 3.8 cm purple plastic panel with clear glue (females = 9; males = 13), and the 30.5 cm wooden stake with clear glue, which caught no *Chrysobothris*.

Many studies have analyzed the importance of trap color for capturing buprestid beetles (Francesca et al. 2011; Cavaletto et al. 2020; Perkovich et al. 2022). Recent studies have concluded that the best trap color for some buprestids, including *Chrysobothris*, reflect in the violet range (300–400 nm) of the electromagnetic spectrum (Cavaletto et al. 2020; Perkovich et al. 2022). Purple colors like the plastic panels and colored glues used in this study reflect in both the violet and visible red (625–750 nm) range. Although color is important for buprestid attraction to traps, trap design also can be a factor in insect catch success (Ryall 2015). In this study, several trap designs caught relatively high numbers of buprestids, but trap designs that were narrow and purple plastic with clear glue caught the most *Chrysobothris*.

The most effective trap designs potentially model the ecological preferences of the target pest. Trap color and shape can promote capture rates if the targeted pest uses these visual cues for locating hosts. Additional elements such as the incorporation of semiochemicals from host plants or conspecific pheromones may increase the specificity of visual attraction (Silk et al. 2019; Peterson et al. 2020). *Chrysobothris* species of economic concern prefer to oviposit on small tree trunks like those found in tree nurseries (Oliver et al. 2010; Başpınar et al. 2018; Dawadi et al. 2019). *Chrysobothris* may prefer the narrower 3.8 cm box design in this study because it mimics a young sapling tree trunk. It is important to note that the original plastic panel box design did not perform well in field conditions. The box trap design often folded in on themselves creating a 2-dimensional flat surface rather than the original 4-dimensional box shape. Despite having a larger surface area than the box design, the triangular prism traps with 15.2 cm wide panel sides did not have a statistically greater catch of *Chrysobothris* than the box trap ( $P = 0.231$ ). However, the triangular prism trap did have a greater structural stability; during field observations, the box design folded in and collapsed. Based on the results of these 2 trials, future trapping experiments should investigate modifications of a purple plastic panel trap in a triangular prism design with smaller panel widths (i.e., 3.8 cm). The triangular prism shape is more structurally rigid and potentially resembles a small tree trunk oviposition target of the female *Chrysobothris*.

The authors thank Crystal Lemings and Caleb West (Tennessee State University, McMinnville, Tennessee, USA) and Sue Scholl (USDA-ARS, US National Arboretum, McMinnville, Tennessee, USA) for their technical support. We also thank Tennessee State University Nursery Research Center for field space to conduct the trap tests, and Richard Westcott (Oregon Department of Agriculture, Plant Division, Entomology Museum, Salem, Oregon, USA) for his assistance identifying beetles. This work is supported by Specialty Crop Research Initiative [grant no. 2020-51181-32199] from the USDA National Institute of Food and Agriculture. Any opinions, find-

**Table 2.** Mean (± SE) total buprestids, *Chrysobothris*, *Chrysobothris* females, or *Chrysobothris* males captured on different trap designs in 2005.

Material	Size (cm)	Trap features				Mean (± SE) total trap captures						
		Shape	Base color	Glue color <sup>1</sup>	L*	a*	b*	PR (nm)	Buprestids	Chrysobothris <sup>2</sup>		Male Chrysobothris
										Female Chrysobothris <sup>3</sup>		
Plastic	15.2	Triangle	Purple	Clear	3.09	2.42	-5.76	740	62 ± 1.3 a	37 ± 1.4 a	33 ± 0.9 a*	4 ± 0.2 b
Plastic	3.8	Box	Purple	Clear	3.09	2.42	-5.76	740	61 ± 1.7 a	43 ± 1.4 a	29 ± 1.3 a*	14 ± 0.9 a
Plastic	30.5	Panel	White	Purple	14.03	4.11	-6.14	740	59 ± 2.2 a	25 ± 1.3 b	18 ± 1.3 b*	7 ± 0.2 b
Plastic	30.5	Panel	Purple	Clear	3.09	2.42	-5.76	740	51 ± 1.0 a	22 ± 1.2 b	9 ± 0.8 c*	13 ± 0.6 a
Plastic	15.2	Panel	Purple	Clear	3.09	2.42	-5.76	740	37 ± 1.4 b	23 ± 1.0 b	16 ± 1.1 b*	7 ± 1.2 b
Wood	3.8	Box	Tan	Purple	12.03	3.32	1.04	740	28 ± 0.9 c	16 ± 0.5 b	11 ± 0.8 bc*	5 ± 0.3 b
Wood	3.8	Box	Tan	Clear	11.49	3.43	10.19	740	3 ± 0.1 d	0 ± 0.0 c	0 ± 0.0 d	0 ± 0.0 b

<sup>1</sup>Glue colors: “Clear” = unmodified Pesticide glue, acrylic violet-reflecting colored paint that was mixed into the clear glue included “Purple” = Folkart 411.

<sup>2</sup>*Chrysobothris* species included *C. adelpha* (n = 31), *C. azurea* (n = 8), *C. cibriaria* (n = 8), *C. femorata* (n = 7), *C. quadrimpressa* (n = 72), *C. rugosiceps* (n = 13), *C. sexsignata* (n = 30), *C. shawnee* (n = 1), and *C. viridiceps* (n = 2).

<sup>3</sup>The asterisk (\*) in the total female *Chrysobothris* captured column indicates statistically greater captures of females than males on those traps. “L” = lightness, “a” = red to green, “b” = blue to yellow, “PR” = peak reflectance (nm, see text for description). Different letters within columns indicate significant differences between means in a Tukey’s HSD test.

ings, conclusions, or recommendations expressed in this publication are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the view of the USDA. Trade names mentioned are for informational purposes only and do not imply an endorsement by Tennessee State University or the USDA.

## Summary

Using an appropriate trap design can significantly increase trap capture rates for specific insect pests. *Chrysobothris* are common buprestid pests in nursery production. Using traps that are shaped to mimic preferred tree hosts captured higher numbers of *Chrysobothris* than other trap designs. Based on these tests, the best trap design (shape and materials) for *Chrysobothris* monitoring was clear glue on a purple plastic trap folded into a triangular prism shape with panel widths (i.e., 3.8 cm) and trap height (i.e., 1 m) similar to a young sapling tree trunk. Our trap design will help in *Chrysobothris* pest management strategies for tree nurseries by increasing capture success rates and leading to overall better monitoring of *Chrysobothris* populations in nursery production.

Key Words: beetles; flatheaded borers; jewel beetles; pest monitoring; visual cues

## Sumario

El uso de un diseño de trampa apropiado puede aumentar significativamente la tasa de captura de las trampas para plagas de insectos específicos. *Chrysobothris* son plagas buprestidas comunes en viveros en producción. El uso de trampas que imitan la forma de los árboles hospederos preferidos capturó un mayor número de *Chrysobothris* que otros diseños de trampas. Con base en estas pruebas, el mejor diseño de trampa (forma y materiales) para el monitoreo de *Chrysobothris* fue pegamento transparente en una trampa de plástico púrpura doblada en forma de prisma triangular con el ancho de los paneles (3,8 cm) y su altura (1 m) similares a un tronco de árbol joven. Nuestro diseño de trampa ayudará en las estrategias de manejo de plagas de *Chrysobothris* en los viveros de árboles al aumentar la tasa de éxito de captura y llegar a un mejor monitoreo general de las poblaciones de *Chrysobothris* en la producción en viveros.

Palabras Clave: escarabajos; barrenadores de cabeza plana; escarabajos joya; monitoreo de plagas; señales visuales

## References Cited

- Addesso KM, Oliver JB, Youssef NN, Fare DC. 2020. Evaluation of systemic imidacloprid and herbicide treatments on flatheaded borer (Coleoptera: Buprestidae) management in field nursery production. *Journal of Economic Entomology* 113: 2808–2819.
- Başpınar H, Doll D, Rijal J. 2018. Pest management in organic almond, pp. 328–347 *In* Vacante V, Kreiter S [Eds.], *Handbook of Pest Management in Organic Farming*. CAB International, Boston, Massachusetts, USA.
- Bates D, Maechler M, Bolker B, Walker S, Christensen RHB, Singmann H, Grothendieck G. 2017. Linear mixed-effects models using ‘Eigen’ and S4. R package, version 1.1-15.1–117. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria.
- Brooks FE. 1919. The Flat-headed apple-tree borer. US Department of Agriculture Farmer’s Bulletin 1065. US Government Printing Office, Washington, DC, USA.
- Cavaletto G, Faccoli M, Marini L, Spaethe J, Magnani G, Rassati D. 2020. Effect of trap color on captures of bark- and wood-boring beetles (Coleoptera: Buprestidae and Scolytinae) and associated predators. *Insects* 11: 749. doi: 10.3390/insects11110749
- Dawadi S, Oliver JB, O’Neal P, Addesso KM. 2019. Management of flatheaded apple tree borer (*Chrysobothris femorata* Olivier) in woody ornamental nursery production with a winter cover crop. *Pest Management Science* 75: 1971–1978.
- Downie NM, Arnette Jr RH. 1995. The Beetles of Northeastern North America, Volume 1. Sandhill Crane Press, Gainesville, Florida, USA.
- Francese JA, Fraser I, Lance DR, Mastro VC. 2011. Efficacy of multifunnel traps for capturing emerald ash borer (Coleoptera: Buprestidae): effect of color, glue, and other trap coatings. *Journal of Economic Entomology* 104: 901–908.
- Frank SD, Klingeman III WE, White SA, Fulcher A. 2013. Biology, injury, and management of maple tree pests in nurseries and urban landscapes. *Journal of Integrated Pest Management* 4: 1–14.
- Haack RA, Petrice T. 2019. Historical population increases and related inciting factors of *Agrilus anxius*, *Agrilus bilineatus*, and *Agrilus granularis liragus* (Coleoptera: Buprestidae) in the Lake States (Michigan, Minnesota, and Wisconsin). *The Great Lakes Entomologist* 52: 21–33.
- Imrei Z, Lohonayi Z, Csóka G, Muskovits J, Szanyi S, Véték G, Fail J, Tóth M, Domingue MJ. 2020. Improving trapping methods for buprestid beetles to enhance monitoring of native and invasive species. *Forestry* 93: 254–264.
- LeBude A, Adkins C. 2014. Incidence and severity of buprestid infestation in field-grown *Acer platanoides* related to cardinal orientation of understock bud union. *Journal of Environmental Horticulture* 4: 215–218.
- LeBude AV, White SA, Fulcher AF, Frank S, Klingeman III WE, Chong JH, Chappell MR, Windham A, Braman K, Hale F, Dunwell W, Williams-Woodward J, Ivors K, Adkins C, Neal J. 2012. Assessing the integrated pest management practices of southeastern US ornamental nursery operations. *Pest Management Science* 68: 1278–1288.
- Oliver JB, Fare DC, Youssef NN, Klingeman W. 2003. Collection of adult flatheaded borers using multicolored traps, pp. 193–199 *In* Oliver JB [Ed.], *Proceedings of the 48th Southern Nursery Association Research Conference*, 30–31 Jul 2003. Atlanta, Georgia, USA.
- Oliver JB, Fare DC, Youssef NN, Scholl SS, Reding ME, Ranger CM, Moyseenko JJ, Halcomb MA. 2010. Evaluation of single application of neonicotinoid and multi-application contact insecticides for flatheaded borer management in field grown red maple cultivars. *Journal of Environmental Horticulture* 28: 135–149.
- Perkovich CL, Addesso KM, Basham JP, Fare DC, Youssef NN, Oliver JB. 2022. Effects of color attributes on trap capture rates of *Chrysobothris femorata* (Coleoptera: Buprestidae) and related species. *Environmental Entomology* 51: 737–746.
- Peterson DL, Böröczky K, Tumlinson J, Cipollini D. 2020. Ecological fitting: chemical profiles of plant hosts provide insights on selection cues and preferences for a major buprestid pest. *Phytochemistry* 176: 112397. doi.org/10.1016/j.phytochem.2020.112397
- R Core Team. 2021. R: a language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. <https://www.R-project.org/>
- Ryall K. 2015. Detection and sampling of emerald ash borer (Coleoptera: Buprestidae) infestations. *The Canadian Entomologist* 147: 290–299.
- Silk P, Mayo P, Ryall K, Roscoe L. 2019. Semiochemical and communication ecology of the emerald ash borer, *Agrilus planipennis* (Coleoptera: Buprestidae). *Insects* 10: 323. doi: 10.3390/insects10100323
- Vinatier F, Lescourret F, Duyck P, Tixier P. 2012. From IBM to IPM: using individual-based models to design the spatial arrangement of traps and crops in integrated pest management strategies. *Agriculture, Ecosystems, and Environment* 146: 52–59.
- Wellso SG, Manley GV. 2007. A revision of the *Chrysobothris femorata* (Olivier, 1790) species group from North America, north of Mexico (Coleoptera: Buprestidae). *Zootaxa* 1652: 1–26.
- Werle CT, Bray AM, Oliver JB, Blythe EK, Sampson BJ. 2014. Ambrosia beetle (Coleoptera: Curculionidae: Scolytinae) captures using colored traps in south-east Tennessee and south Mississippi. *Journal of Entomological Science* 49: 373–382.