Journal of Apicultural Research

ISSN: 0021-8839 (Print) 2078-6913 (Online) Journal homepage: http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/tjar20

Preliminary analysis of loss rates of honey bee colonies during winter 2015/16 from the COLOSS survey

Robert Brodschneider, Alison Gray, Romée van der Zee, Noureddine Adjlane, Valters Brusbardis, Jean-Daniel Charrière, Robert Chlebo, Mary F Coffey, Karl Crailsheim, Bjørn Dahle, Jiří Danihlík, Ellen Danneels, Dirk C de Graaf, Marica Maja Dražić, Mariia Fedoriak, Ivan Forsythe, Miroljub Golubovski, Ales Gregorc, Urszula Grzęda, Ian Hubbuck, Rahşan İvgin Tunca, Lassi Kauko, Ole Kilpinen, Justinas Kretavicius, Preben Kristiansen, Maritta Martikkala, Raquel Martín-Hernández, Franco Mutinelli, Magnus Peterson, Christoph Otten, Aslı Ozkirim, Aivar Raudmets, Noa Simon-Delso, Victoria Soroker, Grazyna Topolska, Julien Vallon, Flemming Vejsnæs & Saskia Woehl

To cite this article: Robert Brodschneider, Alison Gray, Romée van der Zee, Noureddine Adjlane, Valters Brusbardis, Jean-Daniel Charrière, Robert Chlebo, Mary F Coffey, Karl Crailsheim, Bjørn Dahle, Jiří Danihlík, Ellen Danneels, Dirk C de Graaf, Marica Maja Dražić, Mariia Fedoriak, Ivan Forsythe, Miroljub Golubovski, Ales Gregorc, Urszula Grzęda, Ian Hubbuck, Rahşan İvgin Tunca, Lassi Kauko, Ole Kilpinen, Justinas Kretavicius, Preben Kristiansen, Maritta Martikkala, Raquel Martín-Hernández, Franco Mutinelli, Magnus Peterson, Christoph Otten, Aslı Ozkirim, Aivar Raudmets, Noa Simon-Delso, Victoria Soroker, Grazyna Topolska, Julien Vallon, Flemming Vejsnæs & Saskia Woehl (2016) Preliminary analysis of loss rates of honey bee colonies during winter 2015/16 from the COLOSS survey, Journal of Apicultural Research, 55:5, 375-378, DOI: 10.1080/00218839.2016.1260240

To link to this article: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00218839.2016.1260240

Published online: 02 Dec 2016.

Journal of Apicultural Research, 2016
Vol. 55, No. 5, 375–378, http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00218839.2016.1260240

NOTES AND COMMENTS

Preliminary analysis of loss rates of honey bee colonies during winter 2015/16 from the COLOSS survey

Robert Brodschneider[a,*,1], Alison Gray[b,†], Romée van der Zee[c,‡], Noureddine Adjlane[d], Valters Brusbardis[e], Jean-Daniel Charrière[f], Robert Chlebo[g], Mary F Coffey[h], Karl Crailsheim[a], Bjørn Dahle[i], Jiří Danihlík[j], Ellen Danneels[k], Dirk C de Graaf[k], Marica Maja Dražić[l], Mariia Fedoriak[m], Ivan Forsythe[n], Miroljub Golubovski[o], Ales Gregorc[p], Urszula Grzęda[q], Ian Hubbuck[r], Rahşan İvgin Tunca[s], Lassi Kauko[t], Ole Kilpinen[u], Justinas Kretavicius[v], Preben Kristiansen[w], Maritta Martikkala[t], Raquel Martín-Hernández[x], Franco Mutinelli[y], Magnus Peterson[b], Christoph Otten[z], Aslı Ozkirim[aa], Aivar Raudmets[bb], Noa Simon-Delso[cc], Victoria Soroker[dd], Grazyna Topolska[q], Julien Vallon[ee], Flemming Vejsnæs[u] and Saskia Woehl[aa]

[a]Institute of Zoology, University of Graz, Graz, Austria; [b]Department of Mathematics and Statistics, University of Strathclyde, Glasgow, UK; [c]Nederlands Centrum Bijenonderzoek (NCB), Tersoal, Netherlands; [d]Department of Biology, Université M'hamed Bougara, Boumerde, Algeria; [e]Latvian Beekeepers Association, Jelgava, Latvia; [f]Agroscope, Swiss Bee Research Center, Bern, Switzerland; [g]Department of Poultry Science and Small Farm Animals, Slovak University of Agriculture, Nitra, Slovakia; [h]Department of Life Sciences, University of Limerick, Limerick, Ireland; [i]Norwegian Beekeepers Association, Kløfta, Norway; [j]Faculty of Science, Palacký University Olomouc, Olomouc, Czech Republic; [k]Honey Bee Valley, Ghent University, Ghent, Belgium; [l]Croatian Agricultural Agency, Zagreb, Croatia; [m]Institute of Biology, Chemistry and Bioresources, Yuriy Fedkovych Chernivtsi National University, Chernivtsi, Ukraine; [n]The Agri-Food and Biosciences Institute, Belfast, UK; [o]Association for Conservation of Macedonian Local Honey Bee (Apis mellifera macedonica) – MacBee, Negorci, Macedonia; [p]Agricultural Institute of Slovenia, Slovenia & Mississippi State University, Poplarville, MS, USA; [q]Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, Department of Pathology and Veterinary Diagnostics, Warsaw University of Life Sciences, Warsaw, Poland; [r]Welsh Beekeepers Association, Welshpool, UK; [s]Department of Plant and Animal Breeding, Apiculture Program, Muğla Sıtkı Koçman University, Mugla, Turkey; [t]Finnish Beekeepers Association, Helsinki, Finland; [u]Danish Beekeepers Association, Sorø, Denmark; [v]Institute of Environment and Ecology, Aleksandras Stulginskis University, Vilnius, Lithuania; [w]Swedish Beekeepers Association, Mantorp, Sweden; [x]Consejería de Agricultura de la Junta de Comunidades de Castilla-La Mancha (CIAPA, IRIAF), Marchamalo, Spain; [y]Istituto Zooprofilattico Sperimentale delle Venezie, Italy; [z]DLR Fachzentrum für Bienen und Imkerei, Mayen, Germany; [aa]Hacettepe University, Ankara, Turkey; [bb]Estonian Beekeepers Association, Tallinn, Estonia; [cc]Beekeeping Research and Information Centre, Louvain la Neuve, Belgium; [dd]Agricultural Research Organization, The Volcani Center, Bet Dagan, Israel; [ee]ITSAP-Institut de l'abeille, Avignon, France

(*Received 5 September 2016; accepted 7 November 2016*)

In this short note we present comparable loss rates of honey bee colonies during winter 2015/16 from 29 countries, obtained with the COLOSS questionnaire. Altogether, we received valid answers from 19,952 beekeepers. These beekeepers collectively wintered 421,238 colonies, and reported 18,587 colonies with unsolvable queen problems and 32,048 dead colonies after winter. This gives an overall loss rate of 12.0% (95% confidence interval 11.8–12.2%) during winter 2015/16, with marked differences among countries. Beekeepers in the present study assessed 7.6% (95% CI 7.4–7.8%) of their colonies as dead or empty, and 4.4% (95% CI 4.3–4.5%) as having unsolvable queen problems after winter. The overall analysis showed that small operations suffered higher losses than larger ones. A table with detailed results and a map showing response and relative risks at regional level are presented.

Keywords: *Apis mellifera*; apiculture; colony loss; monitoring; winter survival; beekeeping; survey; citizen science

Honey bees face several biotic and abiotic threats. In temperate climates, the overwintering period with no available forage is a critical phase for colony survival. In most countries there is a lack of data for colony losses, or it is not accompanied by other information, for example on hive management, that allows epidemiological risk analysis. In the past decade, research initiatives started to investigate winter losses of honey bee colonies. One of the efforts, including many European and some non-European countries (van der Zee et al., 2012, 2014) is organized through COLOSS (prevention of honey bee colony losses, currently a non-profit organization). Making use of standardized methods for surveys of beekeepers (van der Zee et al., 2013), this investigation provides a quick, but well accepted, measure of colony loss rates, and aims to identify regions with increased risk as well as to identify best practice hive management. In a previous study, inappropriate treatment against the parasitic mite *Varroa destructor*, access of foraging honey bees to certain crops, queen problems in summer and queen age have been demonstrated to significantly affect winter mortality (van der Zee et al., 2014).

In our most recent COLOSS survey starting in spring 2016, we asked beekeepers for the number of colonies

*Corresponding author. E-mail: Robert.Brodschneider@uni-graz.at

[1]Robert Brodschneider conceived the idea for the paper and wrote a first draft.

[†]Did data processing and editing, all statistical analysis for the table, and contributed to the text.

[‡]Did data processing and editing, calculation of relative risks and the associated map, and input to the text.

wintered and how many of these colonies after winter (a) were alive but had unsolvable queen problems (like drone-laying queens or no queen at all) and (b) were dead or reduced to a few hundred bees. By the end of June 2016, 29 countries had contributed data to our study. These data were collected centrally, processed and used for preliminary analysis for this short note. Data files were checked for consistency of loss data (i.e. number of colonies at start of winter should not be missing, and should be greater than zero, number of

Table 1. Number of respondents, number of colonies going into winter, mortality rate (including 95% confidence interval, CI), loss rate of colonies due to queen problems, overall loss rate, response rate per country (expressed as percentage of responses per estimated number of beekeepers, though a few surveys were random and invited only selected beekeepers to participate) and effect of operation size. Mortality and loss rates were calculated as colonies lost as a percentage of colonies wintered, CIs were calculated using the quasi-binomial generalized linear modeling (GzLM) approach in van der Zee et al. (2013), and effect of operation size was tested using a single factor quasi-binomial GzLM to model probability of loss, see text for classification of operation sizes S, M, L.

Country	No. of respon-dents	No. of colonies going into winter	% Mortality rate (95% CI)	% Rate of loss of colonies due to queen problems (95% CI)	Overall winter loss rate (95% CI)	Estimated % of beekeepers represented	Effect of operation size
Austria	1289	23,418	4.5 (4.0–5.2)	3.6 (3.3–3.9)	8.1 (7.4–8.8)	5	***M, L < S
Belgium	451	4064	6.9 (5.8–8.3)	5.2 (4.1–6.6)	12.2 (10.5–14.0)	5	Ns, few in class M/L
Czech Republic	968	17,350	4.1 (3.6–4.7)	2.2 (2.0–2.5)	6.4 (5.8–7.1)	2	Ns, few in class L
Denmark	1186	12,359	6.9 (6.2–7.6)	8.6 (8.0–9.3)	15.5 (14.4–16.7)	19	***L < S, M
Estonia	71	5115	11.2 (8.5–14.7)	4.3 (2.9–6.2)	15.5 (12.2–19.5)	1	**L < S
Finland	339	9222	10.8 (9.5–12.1)	4.7 (4.0–5.4)	15.4 (13.9–17.0)	11	*L < S
France	488	36,734	9.6 (8.5–10.8)	3.8 (3.4–4.3)	13.4 (12.2–14.7)	1	Ns
Germany	5952	75,419	8.3 (7.9–8.6)	3.5 (3.3–3.6)	11.7 (11.4–12.1)	5	*L < S, M
Ireland	427	4059	16.9 (15.2–18.9)	12.6 (11.1–14.2)	29.5 (27.4–31.7)	14	*M > S; no class L
Israel	49	32,165	5.3 (3.7–7.5)	5.2 (4.1–6.5)	10.5 (8.2–13.2)	10	Ns
Latvia	472	16,367	7.4 (6.5–8.5)	7.6 (6.1–9.5)	15.0 (13.1–17.2)	11	*L > S,M
Macedonia	296	17,288	5.0 (4.4–5.7	3.0 (2.6–3.5)	8.0 (7.1–8.9)	10	Ns, but M<S
Netherlands	1425	11,815	7.4 (6.7–8.2)	3.4 (3.0–3.8)	10.8 (9.9–11.7)	20	Ns, no class L
Northern Ireland	93	574	14.3 (10.8–18.6)	13.9 (10.3–18.6)	28.2 (22.6–34.6)	9	N/a; only class S
Norway	743	13,249	8.0 (7.0–9.1)	4.1 (3.7–4.7)	12.1 (11.0–13.3)	21	***M, L < S
Poland	492	17,822	6.0 (5.1–7.1)	5.2 (4.7–5.9)	11.3 (10.2–12.5)	1	**M < S; few in class L
Scotland	154	701	12.8 (10.1–16.2)	5.1 (3.4–7.6)	18.0 (14.6–21.9)	11	N/a; only class S
Slovakia	276	6783	4.0 (3.0–5.2)	4.2 (3.4–5.2)	8.2 (6.8–9.7)	2	Ns, few in class L
Slovenia	267	7910	11.1 (8.9–13.7)	3.2 (2.6–3.8)	14.2 (11.8–17.1)	3	Ns
Sweden	2092	25,403	10.0 (9.3–10.7)	5.9 (5.5–6.4)	15.9 (15.1–16.8)	15	***M, L < S
Switzerland	1259	17,813	4.8 (4.3–5.4)	5.1 (4.7–5.5)	9.9 (9.2–10.7)	7	*M < S; no class L
Ukraine	399	13,850	6.3 (5.3–7.5)	3.6 (2.9–4.5)	9.9 (8.5–11.4)	<1	***L < M < S
Countries with a data-set mostly for a limited number of regions							
Algeria	59	5729	11.9 (9.9–14.3)	1.3 (0.9–1.9)	13.2 (11.0–15.9)	<1	Ns
Italy	309	6815	6.7 (5.6–8.1)	5.8 (4.8–7.2)	12.5 (10.9–14.5)	1	*L < S
Spain	113	10,786	15.4 (12.6–18.7)	6.7 (5.0–9.1)	22.1 (18.7–26.0)	<1	*L < S, M
Turkey	139	22,160	4.9 (3.6–6.7)	2.8 (1.9–4.0)	7.7 (5.7–10.2)	<1	***L < S, M
Countries with limited data at this time							
Croatia	62	4303	13.8 (9.2–20.1)	2.6 (1.8–3.8)	16.4 (11.6–22.7)	<1	*, but no sig. diffs, few in class L
Lithuania	43	1733	14.1 (10.7–18.4)	4.6 (2.8–7.4)	18.7 (14.4–24.0)	N/a	***L < S,M, but only 1 in class L
Wales	39	232	12.1 (7.2–19.6)	10.3 (6.9–15.3)	22.4 (16.0–30.4)	1	N/a; only class S
Overall	19,952	421,238	7.6 (7.4–7.8)	4.4 (4.3–4.5)	12.0 (11.8–12.2)	N/a	***M, L < S

Notes: Significance codes for *p*-values: ***p <= 0.001; **0.001 < p <= 0.01; *0.01 < p <= 0.05; Ns = non-significant (p > 0.05).

colonies dead or lost due to queen problems should not be missing and should be greater than or equal to zero, number of dead colonies plus number of colonies lost due to queen problems should not be greater than number of colonies at start of winter). Altogether, we received valid answers from 19,952 beekeepers. These beekeepers collectively wintered 421,238 colonies, and reported 18,587 colonies with unsolvable queen problems and 32,048 dead colonies after winter. This gives an overall loss rate of 12.0% (95% confidence interval 11.8–12.2%) during winter 2015/16, with marked differences among countries (Table 1). The highest loss rate was found in Ireland and Northern Ireland, followed by Wales and also Spain, whereas it was lowest in the Czech Republic and central Europe in general. Note that from Wales and Spain, but also some other countries, only a low number of responses, sometimes from certain regions only, were available this year. Relative risk calculations at regional level (regional loss rates divided by the overall loss rate; Figure 1) also highlight raised risk of loss in Scotland, Denmark, parts of Sweden and France, and some areas in Eastern Europe.

The overall loss rate of colonies over the winter of 2015/16 is methodologically comparable to previous studies, for example the winter of 2012/13 with an overall loss rate of 16.1%, but of course with different coverage of participating countries and regions (van der Zee et al., 2014). For the same winter, a pan-European surveillance program, implemented in 17 countries, ascertained winter mortality based on field inspections to range from 4.7 to 30.6% in different countries (Chauzat et al., 2016). They found that clinically detected diseases (varroosis, American foulbrood, and nosemosis) before winter significantly contribute to winter mortality. The calculation of loss rates presented in this note is methodologically not entirely comparable to those in the USA, but established surveys report for example a total loss rate of 22.3% for the winter of 2014/15 in the USA and even higher in some previous years (Seitz et al., 2015).

The loss rates presented in our previous publications likewise included both dead colonies (or empty hives) and colonies with queen problems, but as the sum of these two cases of loss (van der Zee et al., 2012, 2014). Beekeepers in the present study differentiated these two cases, and assessed 7.6% (95% CI 7.4–7.8%) of their colonies as dead or empty, and 4.4% (95% CI 4.3–4.5%) having unsolvable queen problems after winter. This underlines and, for the first time in Europe, quantifies often experienced but poorly studied symptoms associated with unknown pathogenesis or apparently spontaneous colony mortality (Tarpy, Lengerich, & Pettis, 2013). Again, winter losses related to queen problems



Figure 1. Map showing relative risk of overwinter loss at regional level (where sufficient beekeepers were represented in a region, taken as 6 or more beekeepers here).
Note: Regions with a loss rate significantly higher/lower than the overall loss rate are shown in red/green respectively.

(including a missing queen, laying workers, or a drone egg laying queen) varied between 1.3% in Algeria and 2.2% in the Czech Republic to 12.6% in Ireland and 13.9% in Northern Ireland (Table 1) and further surveillance of this phenomenon and the investigation of possible causes are recommended. More detailed studies are needed to investigate whether apicultural management, such as annual or biennial re-queening, can mitigate this problem.

The full COLOSS survey data-set allows for a number of possible risk factors for colony loss to be analyzed. In this note we focus on an often investigated factor, operation size. We grouped beekeeping operations into small (S, 1–50 colonies; by far the most common in the countries represented here), medium (M, 51–150 colonies) and large (L, 151 colonies or more) operations, and found that in most countries, and also overall, class S had a significantly higher loss rate than class L and/or class M. This is comparable to previous findings (Chauzat et al., 2016; Seitz et al., 2015; van der Zee et al., 2014).

In this short note we present comparable loss rates of honey bee colonies during winter 2015/16 from 29 countries. Whereas the COLOSS monitoring of colony losses in some countries is well established and covers an appreciable proportion of beekeepers (Table 1), the response from some other countries is limited in number or is mostly confined to some regions only (Figure 1). We therefore aim to strengthen and extend this joint effort to gain more insight into colony losses. A more detailed statistical analysis of risk of losses, and other variables, including several years of data, is planned for separate publication.

Acknowledgements

The colony loss monitoring group which carried out this study is a core project of the COLOSS Association. COLOSS supports regular workshops facilitating research discussions and collaboration between group members, and aims to explain and prevent massive honey bee colony losses. It was funded through the COST Action FA0803 and is now supported by the Ricola Foundation – Nature & Culture. The authors thank very much the many beekeepers who completed the COLOSS questionnaire providing the data for this work. The authors are also grateful to various national funding sources for their support of some of the monitoring surveys. Open Access was provided by the project "Zukunft Biene" (grant number: 100972) funded by the Austrian Federal Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry, Environment and Water Management.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

ORCID

Robert Brodschneider http://orcid.org/0000-0002-2535-0280
Alison Gray http://orcid.org/0000-0002-6273-0637
Jean-Daniel Charrière http://orcid.org/0000-0003-3732-4917
Robert Chlebo http://orcid.org/0000-0001-8715-0578
Dirk C de Graaf http://orcid.org/0000-0001-8817-0781
Mariia Fedoriak http://orcid.org/0000-0002-6200-1012
Ivan Forsythe http://orcid.org/0000-0002-8642-102X
Lassi Kauko http://orcid.org/0000-0001-7836-6553
Ole Kilpinen http://orcid.org/0000-0001-6972-1648
Preben Kristiansen http://orcid.org/0000-0001-6718-2214
Maritta Martikkala http://orcid.org/0000-0001-5761-8627
Raquel Martín-Hernández http://orcid.org/0000-0002-1730-9368
Franco Mutinelli http://orcid.org/0000-0003-2903-9390
Christoph Otten http://orcid.org/0000-0001-5324-2255
Aslı Ozkirim http://orcid.org/0000-0002-8930-2587
Noa Simon-Delso http://orcid.org/0000-0003-1729-890X

References

Chauzat, M.P., Jacques, A., Laurent, M., Bougeard, S., Hendrikx, P., Ribière-Chabert, M., & EPILOBEE Consortium. (2016). Risk indicators affecting honey bee colony survival in Europe: One year of surveillance. *Apidologie, 47*, 348–378. doi:10.1007/s13592-016-0440-z

Seitz, N., Traynor, K.S., Steinhauer, N., Rennich, K., Wilson, M.E., Ellis, J.D., … vanEngelsdorp, D. (2015). A national survey of managed honey bee 2014–2015 annual colony losses in the USA. *Journal of Apicultural Research, 54*, 292–304. doi:10.1080/00218839.2016.1153294

Tarpy, D.R., Lengerich, E.J., & Pettis, J.S. (2013). Idiopathic brood disease syndrome and queen events as precursors of colony mortality in migratory beekeeping operations in the eastern United States. *Preventive Veterinary Medicine, 108*, 225–233. doi:10.1016/j.prevetmed.2012.08.004

van der Zee, R., Pisa, L., Andonov, S., Brodschneider, R., Charrière, J.D., Chlebo, R., … Wilkins, S. (2012). Managed honey bee colony losses in Canada, China, Europe, Israel and Turkey, for the winters of 2008–9 and 2009–10. *Journal of Apicultural Research, 51*, 100–114. doi:10.3896/IBRA.1.51.1.12

van der Zee, R., Gray, A., Holzmann, C., Pisa, L., Brodschneider, R., Chlebo, R., … Wilkins, S. (2013). Standard survey methods for estimating colony losses and explanatory risk factors in *Apis mellifera*. In V. Dietemann, J.D. Ellis, & P. Neumann (Eds.), *The COLOSS BEEBOOK, Volume II: Standard methods for* Apis mellifera *pest and pathogen research. Journal of Apicultural Research, 52*(4). doi:10.3896/IBRA.1.52.4.18

van der Zee, R., Brodschneider, R., Brusbardis, V., Charrière, J.-D., Chlebo, R., Coffey, M.F., … Gray, A. (2014). Results of international standardized beekeeper surveys of colony losses for winter 2012–2013: Analysis of winter loss rates and mixed effects modelling of risk factors for winter loss. *Journal of Apicultural Research, 53*, 19–34. doi:10.3896/IBRA.1.53.1.02