Screening of Emerging risks in Norway (ERIN). Judgments are preliminary and should not be considered as part of a final risk assessment:

Bursaphelenchus xylophilus (Steiner & Buhrer 1934) Nickle, 1970

1. Taxonomic position: Nematoda: Aphelenchoididae: Parasitaphelenchinae; **Popular names**: Pinewood Nematode (PWN) (English); Furuvednematode (FVN) (Norwegian).

2a.	Status	in N	orway
Za.	Jiaius	111 13	ui wav.

Established	Intercepted but not established \square	Not intercepted ⊠

If intercepted or established, provide supplementary information:

- 2b. If this species is already established in Norway and this assessment is limited to a part of Norway where it may expand, define this part area of Norway:
- 3. Area of native distribution in the world and information about introductions, expansions and eradications:

The nematode is endemic to North America. It was detected in Japan in 1905 (Mamiya 1984), China in 1982 (Zhao 2008), Taiwan in 1985 (ref.) Korea in 1988 (Shin 2008) and Mexico in 1993 (Dwinell 1993) Portugal in 1999 (Mota et al. 2000) and Madeira Island in 2009 (Fonseca et al 2011). At least 5 outbreaks in Spain close to the Portuguese boarder in 2008, 2010, 2012, 2013 and 2014 which have been eradicated (refs.).

4. Sector in Norway expected to be impacted by the species (related to question 10 below):

Agriculture	Forest(ry) ⊠	Ornamental/park/garden ⊠	Fruit orchard/garden □
Greenhouse/protect	ed 🗆 Othe	r sector, or not relevant \square Describe	:

5. Susceptible host(s) and/or type of environment(s) in Norway:

The major hosts are found in the genus *Pinus*. *Pinus sylvestris* is one of the most susceptible species to PWN, making pine forests, as well as open landscapes and urban environments endangered biotopes. In addition hosts for PWN also occur also in the genera *Abies*, *Picea* and *Larix*, The nematode is polyfagous and reproduces on a variety of wood fungi. PWN has a remarkable flexibility in its biology making it capable of exploiting new geographical situations (Evans *et al.* 1996). This plasticity will allow the nematode to establish in the entire forest area of Norway. Winter mortality is not expected to limit PWN from living in the PRA area as the nematode already lives in areas in Canada and northern Japan where winter temperatures are similar or lower than in the commercially important forested areas of Norway (WKM 2008).

6. Description of damage:

The principal damage caused by PWN is the wilting of infested and susceptible trees (Pine Wilt Disease - PWD). The PWN is spread by vector insects in the genus *Monochamus*. The most important vector in Asia is *M. alternatus* (Mamiya 1984). The only vector insect recorded in Europe is *M. galloprovincialis* (Sousa *et al.* 2001). At present *M. galloprovincialis* has a restricted occurrence in the PRA area, while *M. sutor* is the most widespread species. *M. urussovii* has only old scattered records from the southern part of Norway (Bakke & Kvamme 1992; Ehnström & Holmer 2007). The vector status of *M. sutor* for PWN is not known.

When nematode infected beetles feed on the thin bark of branches and shoots, the PWN dispersal stage enter wood through the feeding scars and spread rapidly in the whole tree causing a dysfunctioning of the membranes that connect wood tracheids. This leads to an increasing and

irreversible disruption of the water flow and rapid death of the tree (Futai 2013). Among pine species *P. sylvestris* seems highly susceptible (Evans *et al.* 1996; Malek & Appleby 1984).

Due to low summer temperatures in Norway damage in the current climate will probably be low. Mean July -August temperatures above 20°C is necessary for symptom expression. Below this temperature PWN is present but the disease is not expressed (Rutherford and Webster 1987, Gruffudd *et al* 2016).

However, in connection with operations of eradication and containment considerable areas of forest will be affected to the disadvantage of natural biotopes and ecosystem services (Bergseng *et al.* 2012).

7a. How is the ove	erall probability o	f <u>entry</u> in No	rway, or in a	defin	ed part	of No	rway?	
0. not relevant \square	1. very low \square	2. low	3. medium [4. high	\boxtimes	5. very hi	gh 🗆
		Level of un	certainty:	Low		Medi	um 🗵	High \square
7b. How is the ove	erall probability o	f <u>establishm</u>	<u>ent</u> in Norwa	y, or i	n a def	ined p	art of No	rway?
0. not relevant \square	1. very low \square	2. low □	3. medium [4. high		5. very hi	gh ⊠
		Level of un	certainty:	Low	\boxtimes	Medi	um 🗌	High \square
Short description of	of factors for the p	orobability as	sessment:					
Short description of	of factors for the p	orobability as	sessment:					
•		•		opula [.]	tion de	nsity).	The biolo	gical
PWN will survive t	ransportation (and	d could even	increase in p	•		• • •		•
•	ransportation (and	d could even	increase in p	•		• • •		•
PWN will survive t	ransportation (and matode would all	d could even ow it to ente	increase in p r and establis	h alm	ost eve	erywhe	ere in Norv	•
PWN will survive t plasticity of the ne	ransportation (and matode would all pest expected to	d could even ow it to ente	increase in p r and establis	sh alm	ost eve	t of N	ere in Norv	way.

The role of asymptomatic carrier trees in the spread of PWD has been recognized for years (Futai 2004; Takeuchi & Futai 2007). In China, and in data from 15 years, short distance spread by vector beetles in the genus *Monochamus* has been estimated to 7,5 km per year, while long distance spread was estimated to 111-339 km. Human population density seemed to have a profound effect on the dispersal of PWN (Robinet et al 2009). That PWN can easily spread between continents by anthropogenic mechanisms, especially in trade of infested wood is well recognized. However, there is an high uncertainty related to an unknown vector status within the PRA. Furthermore, the rather cooler climatic conditions within the PRA area, compared to climatic conditions within references, will as well possess a medium uncertainty related to spread and disease development in affected plants.

9. How large percent of potential environment type in Norway, or in a defined part of Norway, is expected to be colonized?

<5% ⊠	5 - 10 % 🗆	10 - 20 % 🗆	20 - 40 % 🗌	> 40 % ⊠

Due to its biological flexibility in principle, all of the conifer forests of Norway are expected to be colonized of PWN (ie. > 40 %). Damage by tree mortality is very uncertain and would in the current climate probably correspond to <5%.

D. not relevant D. minimal D. minimal D. minimal D. minor D. moderate D	10. How great a ne measures for the in								
Short description of negative effects on economy: Information on these aspects were presented in Sundheim et al. (2010). In the current climatic conditions the introduction of PWN to the Norway area will not cause increased pine tree mortality, with a low uncertainty. Assuming the IS92a climate change scenario for the period 2000-2049 (RegClim), which predicts a "2 e"C temperature increase by the end of the period, an introduction of PWN to Norway will cause a minor increase in pine tree mortality (300 trees per year on average). The mortality can become larger if the temperature increase more than 2 e"C, and will gradually increase with time after 2049 due to spread of PWN. The uncertainty level of these assessments is medium to high. Currently, effects of the presence of PWN Norwegian export of wood and wood products will be of little importance. The uncertainty level of this assessment is low. It will be almost impossible to eradicate PWN once it has been introduced into the PRA area. The uncertainty level of this assessment is low. The net present value of accumulated cost of a single eradication event as described in the preliminary contingency plan for the PRA area is approximately 700 million NOK. The net present value of accumulated cost of the contingency plan following one introduction event will be approximately 2000 million NOK for the initial 50 years. These costs are caused by reduced income from timber production and the expenses of eradication measures. The uncertainty level of these assessments is medium. The negative effects of the control measures on the environment will be major. The uncertainty in relation to forest damage is the possibly higher sensitivity in various conifer provenances to increasing temperatures and nematode infection. There is also a concern that Nordic countries after a hypothetical introduction of PWN could serve as a sources for nematode dissemination to continental Europe. 11. How important is the environmental impact likely to be in Norway, or in a defined part of		r -	-		_			1	
Short description of negative effects on economy: Information on these aspects were presented in Sundheim et al. (2010). In the current climatic conditions the introduction of PWN to the Norway area will not cause increased pine tree mortality, with a low uncertainty. Assuming the IS92a climate change scenario for the period 2000-2049 (RegClim), which predicts a "2 e"C temperature increase by the end of the period, an introduction of PWN to Norway will cause a minor increase in pine tree mortality (300 trees per year on average). The mortality can become larger if the temperature increase more than 2 e"C, and will gradually increase with time after 2049 due to spread of PWN. The uncertainty level of these assessments is medium to high. Currently, effects of the presence of PWN Norwegian export of wood and wood products will be of little importance. The uncertainty level of this assessment is low. It will be almost impossible to eradicate PWN once it has been introduced into the PRA area. The uncertainty level of this assessment is low. The net present value of accumulated cost of a single eradication event as described in the preliminary contingency plan for the PRA area is approximately 700 million NOK. The net present value of accumulated cost of the contingency plan following one introduction event will be approximately 2000 million NOK for the initial 50 years. These costs are caused by reduced income from timber production and the expenses of eradication measures. The uncertainty level of these assessments is medium. The negative effects of the control measures on the environment will be major. The uncertainty in relation to forest damage is the possibly higher sensitivity in various conifer provenances to increasing temperatures and nematode infection. There is also a concern that Nordic countries after a hypothetical introduction of PWN could serve as a sources for nematode dissemination to continental Europe. 11. How important is the environmental impact likely to be in Norway, or in a defined part of			Level of unce	artainty:	Low	\square	Modium		High 🗆
Information on these aspects were presented in Sundheim <i>et al.</i> (2010). In the current climatic conditions the introduction of PVN to the Norway area will not cause increased pine tree mortality, with a low uncertainty. Assuming the 1592a climate change scenario for the period 2000-2049 (RegClim), which predicts a ~2 °C temperature increase by the end of the period, an introduction of PWN to Norway will cause a minor increase in pine tree mortality (300 trees per year on average). The mortality can become larger if the temperature increase more than 2 °C, and will gradually increase with time after 2049 due to spread of PWN. The uncertainty level of these assessments is medium to high. Currently, effects of the presence of PWN Norwegian export of wood and wood products will be of little importance. The uncertainty level of this assessment is low. It will be almost impossible to eradicate PWN once it has been introduced into the PRA area. The uncertainty level of this assessment is low. The net present value of accumulated cost of a single eradication event as described in the preliminary contingency plan for the PRA area is approximately 700 million NOK. The net present value of accumulated cost of the contingency plan following one introduction event will be approximately 2000 million NOK for the initial 50 years. These costs are caused by reduced income from timber production and the expenses of eradication measures on the environment will be major. The uncertainty level of this assessment is low (Sundheim <i>et al.</i> 2010). One item of uncertainty in relation to forest damage is the possibly higher sensitivity in various conifer provenances to increasing temperatures and nematode infection. There is also a concern that Nordic countries after a hypothetical introduction of PWN could serve as a sources for nematode dissemination to continental Europe. 11. How important is the environmental impact likely to be in Norway, or in a defined part of Norway? Rate possible effects: 12. How important is social damage			Level of unce	ertairity.	LOW		iviedium	<u> </u>	півіі 🗆
conifer provenances to increasing temperatures and nematode infection. There is also a concern that Nordic countries after a hypothetical introduction of PWN could serve as a sources for nematode dissemination to continental Europe. 11. How important is the environmental impact likely to be in Norway, or in a defined part of Norway? Rate possible effects: O. not relevant 1. minimal 2. minor 3. moderate 4. major 5. massive	Information on the conditions the intro with a low uncertain (RegClim), which property with the mortality can be increase with time medium to high. Comproducts will be of impossible to erading this assessment is like described in the property and the property will be approximately 2 income from timber these assessments.	se aspects were oduction of PWN inty. Assuming the redicts a ~2 °C to ll cause a minor occome larger if after 2049 due tourrently, effects little importance atte PWN once ow. The net preceliminary continuor accumulated control of accumulated control of million NON is medium. The	presented in Solution to the Norway he IS92a climate emperature increase in pine the temperature to spread of PW of the presence e. The uncertain it has been intresent value of ac gency plan for the cost of the contict of the expenses negative effects.	area will not be change so the ease by the ease by the ease increase in the ease of PWN Not be performed by level of the PRA are ngency plants of years. The of eradications of the control of the contro	ot cau enaric e end c ality (3 more t ertain orweg this as the F cost o a is ap n follo ese co on me trol m	se incr of the p 300 tree than 2 ty level ian exp sessme PRA are of a sing proxim wing o osts are easures	eased pine e period 20 period, an es per year of these a port of woo ent is low. a. The unce hately 700 ne introduce caused by 5. The unce es on the e	e tree 000-20 introd r on av Il grad assessi od and It will ertain tion e millio ction r redu ertaint	mortality, 049 luction of verage). ually ments is I wood be almost ity level of vent as n NOK. The event will ced
O. not relevant 1. minimal 2. minor 3. moderate 4. major 5. massive Level of uncertainty: Low Medium High Short description of environmental impacts: The net present value of accumulated cost of a single eradication event as described in the preliminary contingency plan for the PRA area is approximately 700 million NOK. The net present value of accumulated cost of the contingency plan following one introduction event will be approximately 2000 million NOK for the initial 50 years. These costs are caused by reduced income from timber production and the expenses of eradication measures. The uncertainty level of these assessments is medium. The negative effects of the control measures on the environment will be major. The uncertainty level of this assessment is low (Sundheim et al. 2010). 12. How important is social damage likely to be in in Norway, or in a defined part of Norway? Rate possible effects:	conifer provenance Nordic countries af dissemination to co	es to increasing t ter a hypothetic ontinental Europ	emperatures ar al introduction ee.	nd nematoc of PWN cou	le infe uld ser	ection. The as a	There is als	so a co or nen	oncern that natode
Short description of environmental impacts: The net present value of accumulated cost of a single eradication event as described in the preliminary contingency plan for the PRA area is approximately 700 million NOK. The net present value of accumulated cost of the contingency plan following one introduction event will be approximately 2000 million NOK for the initial 50 years. These costs are caused by reduced income from timber production and the expenses of eradication measures. The uncertainty level of these assessments is medium. The negative effects of the control measures on the environment will be major. The uncertainty level of this assessment is low (Sundheim et al. 2010). 12. How important is social damage likely to be in in Norway, or in a defined part of Norway? Rate possible effects:	•		_						
Short description of environmental impacts: The net present value of accumulated cost of a single eradication event as described in the preliminary contingency plan for the PRA area is approximately 700 million NOK. The net present value of accumulated cost of the contingency plan following one introduction event will be approximately 2000 million NOK for the initial 50 years. These costs are caused by reduced income from timber production and the expenses of eradication measures. The uncertainty level of these assessments is medium. The negative effects of the control measures on the environment will be major. The uncertainty level of this assessment is low (Sundheim et al. 2010). 12. How important is social damage likely to be in in Norway, or in a defined part of Norway? Rate possible effects:	0. not relevant \square	1. minimal \square	2. minor \square	3. moderat	e 🗆	4. maj	or 🗆	5. m	assive \square
The net present value of accumulated cost of a single eradication event as described in the preliminary contingency plan for the PRA area is approximately 700 million NOK. The net present value of accumulated cost of the contingency plan following one introduction event will be approximately 2000 million NOK for the initial 50 years. These costs are caused by reduced income from timber production and the expenses of eradication measures. The uncertainty level of these assessments is medium. The negative effects of the control measures on the environment will be major. The uncertainty level of this assessment is low (Sundheim et al. 2010). 12. How important is social damage likely to be in in Norway, or in a defined part of Norway? Rate possible effects:			Level of unce	ertainty:	Low		Medium		High \square
	The net present value of accumulat approximately 200 from timber product assessments is medians. The uncertainty and important in the control of the control	lue of accumulating and plan for the cost of the cost of the cost of the cost of the cost on and the explain. The negating level of this	ted cost of a single PRA area is apportingency plan or the initial 50 ypenses of eradicive effects of the assessment is I	oproximate following of tears. These cation mease control m ow (Sundhe	ly 700 one int costs sures. easure eim et	millior roduct are ca The ur es on tl al. 201	n NOK. The ion event used by reducertainty he environ 0).	e net p will be duced level d ment	oresent e d income of these will be
THE CONTROL OF THE CO	0. not relevant □	1. minimal \square	2. minor \square	3 moderat	e \Box	4 mai	ior 🛛	5 m	assive \Box

Level of uncertainty:	Low 🗵	Medium \square	High □
-----------------------	-------	------------------	--------

Short description of social damage:

Control measures against PWN will dramatically reduce ecosystem services in infested areas, and could severely affect landscape sceneries and urban environments (Bergseng *et al.* 2012; Sundheim *et al.* 2010).

13. Priority in Norway versus EPPO and EU:

In Norway PWN is listed in Forskrift om planter og tiltak mot planteskadegjørere Vedlegg 2. In Europe PWN is placed on the A2 list of EPPO and in Directive 2000/29/EC II A Section 1 in EU. PWN occurs in Portugal, resulting in Portugal being put under quarantine in relation to other European countries. This means that Norway has a protection level similar to other European countries.

14. Specific questions for Norway:

Wood packing materials WPM of various origin enter Norway at a daily rate of 5 000-10 000 units throughout the year. Gu et al. (2006) reported that 1.2% of inspected pallets in Ningbo were infested with PWN. The pallets sampled were mostly of pine wood (Gu pers. comm.). With the assumption of a similar infection rate in pallets arriving in Norway, it can be calculated that maybe 60-120 units arrive each day potentially infested by PWN (predominantly JIII resting stages). Pallet wood is a popular resource for people, so the end-use of this commodity is completely out of control. It is unclear to which extent the control requirements of ISPM15 will be effective in reducing this threat, since Chinese a reports has questioned the efficacy of the HT (56/30) treatment and detected PWN in wood packaging material marked with HT (VKM 2008).

The common species of pine sawyer in Norway, *Monochamus sutor*, is so far not known to be a vector of PWN. The other species occurring in Norway M. galloprovincialis is already known to vector PWN in Portugal (Sousa *et al.* 2001). The efficacy of both species as vectors of PWN under Norwegian conditions remains an important question to be addressed by future research.

15. Existing assessments:

- EPPO 2009. Report of a Pest Risk Analysis for *Bursaphelenchus xylophilus* 09/15450: 17 pp. Evans, H. F., McNamara, D. G., Braasch, H., Chadoeuf, J. & Magnusson, C. 1996. Pest Risk Analysis (PRA) for the territories of the European Union (as PRA area) on Bursaphelenchus xylophilus and its vectors in the genus Monochamus. EPPO Bulletin 26: 199-249.
- Sundheim, L., Økland, B., Magnusson, C., Solberg, B., Rafoss, T. 2010. Pest risk assessment of the Pine Wood Nematode (PWN) Bursaphelenchus xylophilus in Norway Part 2. Opinion of the Plant Health Panel of the Scientific Committee for Food Safety, 08/906-6_final, ISBN 978-82-8259-002-0 (Electronic edition): 21 pp. VKM, Oslo, Norway.
- Swedish Board of Agriculture 2008. Konsekvensanalys av angrepp av tallvedsnematod i svensk skog [Consequences of an outbreak of pine wood nematode in Swedish forests]. Report 2008(19), Jönköping, Sweden. (In Swedish)
- VKM 2008. Pest risk assessment of the Pine Wood Nematode (PWN) Bursaphelenchus xylophilus in Norway Part 1. Norwegian Scientific Committee for Food Safety 08/906-4.

16. Requested assessments:

No current assessments.

17. Recommended type of assessment:

References

- Bakke A, Kvamme T. 1992. The pine sawyer (Monochamus sutor): Distribution and life history in South Norway. Communications of Skogforsk 44):1–16.
- Bergdahl, D.R. & Halik, S. 2003. Persistence of the pine wood nematode in asymptomatic Scots pines. In: Mota, M. & Vieira, P. (eds.) The Pinewood Nematode, Bursaphelenchus xylophilus. Proc. Intern. Workshop, Univ. of Évora, Portugal, August 20-22 2001. Nematology Monographs and Perspectives 1: 177-183
- Bergseng, B., Økland, B., Gobakken, T., Magnusson, C., Rafoss, T. & Solberg, B. (2012). Combining ecological and economic modelling in analysing a pest invasion contingency plan the case of Pine Wood Nematode in Norway. Scand. J. For. Res. 27: 337-349.
- Dwinell,. D. (1993) First report of pinewood nematode (Bursaphelenchus xylophilus) in Mexico. Plant Disease 11, 846
- Ehnström, B. & Holmer, M. 2007. Nationalnyckeln till Sveriges flora och fauna. Skalbaggar: Långhorningar. Coleoptera: Cerambycidae. ArtDatabanken SLU, Uppsala. 304 pp.
- EPPO 2009. Report of a Pest Risk Analysis for Bursaphelenchus xylophilus 09/15450: 17 pp. https://cse.google.com/cse?cx=003470790268443999025%3Azkgxbagxf44&q=PRA+B.+xylophilus&cof=FORID%3A0&sa.x=10&sa.y=13#gsc.tab=0&gsc.q=PRA%20B.%20xylophilus&gsc.page=1
- EPPO (2010a). Isolated finding of Bursaphelenchus xylophilusin Spain. EPPO Reporting Service, 3 , 2010/051, from http://archives.eppo.org/EPPOReporting/2010/Rse-1003.pdf [Retrieved date]
- EPPO 2012. *Bursaphelenchus xylophilus* and its vectors: procedures for official control. EPPO Bulletin 42: 477–485.
- Evans H. F., Evans, S. & Ikegami, M. 2007. Development of a new risk assessment procedure for pinewood nematode in Europe. In: Gottschalk, Kurt W., (ed.) Proceedings, 17th U.S. Department of Agriculture interagency research forum on gypsy moth and other invasive species 2006 Gen. Tech. Rep. NRS-P-10. Newtown Square, PA: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Northern Research Station: 35-38
- Evans, H. F., McNamara, D. G., Braasch, H., Chadoeuf, J. & Magnusson, C. 1996. Pest Risk Analysis (PRA) for the territories of the European Union (as PRA area) on *Bursaphelenchus xylophilus* and its vectors in the genus *Monochamus*. EPPO Bulletin 26: 199-249.
- Fonseca L, Cardoso J M S, Lopes A, Pestana M, Abreu F, Nunes N, Mota M & Abrantes (2012). The pinewood nematode, *Bursaphelenchus xylophilus*, in Madeira Island. Helminthologia 49: 96-103.
- Futai, K. 2013. Pine Wood Nematode, *Bursaphelenchus xylophilus*. Annual Review of Phytopathology, Vol 51 51:61-83.
- Futai, K. 2004. Role of asymptomatic carrier trees in epidemic spread of pine wilt disease. Journal of Forest Research 8: 253-260.
- Gruffudd HR, Jenkins TAR, Evans HF (2016) Using an evapo-transpiration model (ETpN) to predict the risk and expression of symptoms of pine wilt disease (PWD) across Europe. Biol Invasions DOI 10.1007/s10530-016-1173-7
- Larsson, J. Y. & Hylen, G. 2007. Skogen i Norge. Statistikk over skogforhold og skogressurser i Norge registrert i perioden 2000-2004. Viten fra Skog og Landskap 1/07: 91 pp.
- Malek, R.B. & Appleby, J.E. 1984. Epidemiology of pine wilt in Illinois. Plant Disease 68:180-186.
- Mamiya, Y. 1984. The pine wood nematode. In: Nickle, W.R. (ed.). Plant and Insect Nematodes. Marcel Dekker Inc.: 589-626.
- Mota, M. M., Braasch, H., Bravo, M. A., Penas, A. C., Burgermeister, W., Metge, K. et al. (1999). First report of Bursaphelenchus xylophilus in Portugal and in Europe. Nematology, 1, 727-734.
- NARC. 2008. National Agriculture and Bio-oriented Research Organization. AgModel produced by

- Norwegian Food Safety Authority (2007). Faglig beredskapsplan for furuvednematode. Forslag 16 oktober 2007 [Contingencyplan for Pine Wood Nematode. Draft 16th October 2007]. Retrieved December 6, 2009, from http://mattilsynet.no/aktuelt/nyhetsarkiv/planter/plantehelse/forslag_til_faglig_beredskaps plan_for_furuvednematode_52153. (In Norwegian)
- PHRAME. 2007. PHRAME Plant Health And Monitoring Evaluation Final Report July 2007. QLK5-CT-2002-00672: Development of improved pest risk analysis techniques for quarantine pests, using pinewood nematode, Bursaphelenchus xylophilus, in Portugal as a model system: 245 pp.
- Robinet C, Roques A, Pan H, Fang G, Ye J, et al. (2009) Role of Human-Mediated Dispersal in the Spread of the Pinewood Nematode in China. PLoS ONE 4(2): 646.doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0004646
- Rutherford, T.A. & Webster, J.M. 1987. Distribution of pine wilt disease with respect to temperature in North America, Japan and Europe. Can. J. For. Res. 17: 1050-1059.
- Shin, S-C. 2008. Pine Wilt Disease in Korea. In: Zhao, B.G., Futai, K., Sutherland, J.R. & Takeuchi (eds.) Pine Wilt Disease. Springer: 26-31.
- Sousa, E., Bravo, M.A., Pires, J. Naves, P. Penas, A.C., Bonifácio, L. & Mota, M. M. 2001.

 Bursaphelenchus xylophilus (Nematoda; Aphelenchoididae) associated with Monochamus qalloprovincialis (Coleoptera; Cerambycidae) in Portugal. Nematology 3: 89-91.
- Sundheim, L., Økland, B., Magnusson, C., Solberg, B., Rafoss, T. 2010. Pest risk assessment of the Pine Wood Nematode (PWN) Bursaphelenchus xylophilus in Norway Part 2. Opinion of the Plant Health Panel of the Scientific Committee for Food Safety, 08/906-6_final, ISBN 978-82-8259-002-0 (Electronic edition): 21 pp. VKM, Oslo, Norway.
- Swedish Board of Agriculture 2008. Konsekvensanalys av angrepp av tallvedsnematod i svensk skog [Consequences of an outbreak of pine wood nematode in Swedish forests]. Report 2008(19), Jönköping, Sweden. (In Swedish)
- Takeuchi, Y. & Futai, K. 2007. Asymptomatic carrier trees in pine stands naturally infected with *Bursaphelenchus xylophilus*. Nematology 9: 243-250.
- VKM 2008. Pest risk assessment of the Pine Wood Nematode (PWN) *Bursaphelenchus xylophilus* in Norway Part 1. Norwegian Scientific Committee for Food Safety 08/906-4.
- Zhao, B.G 2008. Pine Wilt Disease in China. In: Zhao, B.G., Futai, K., Sutherland, J.R. & Takeuchi (eds.) Pine Wilt Disease. Springer: 18-25.