Journal of Molecular Biosciences and Engineering

Review Article

Forest Plant Diseases and Pests: Assessing Biological Risks in Tourism Areas

Gadir Mammadov [1] ✉ **and Najaf Mammadzada** [2] ✉

[1] Department of Tourism and Hotel Management, Western Caspian University, Baku, AZ1072, Azerbaijan

[2] Department of Cybersecurity and Computer Engineering, Baku Engineering University, Baku, AZ0101, Azerbaijan

Received: 20.10.2026 Accepted: 28.10.2026 Published: 30.10.2026

https://doi.org/10.54414/BMSL7977

Copyright: © 2026 by the authors. Licensee: Journal of Molecular Biosciences and Engineering, Western Caspian University, Baku, Azerbaijan. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0).

Abstract

Forest health nears from a network of connections: how a tree hacks its own body, how a disease disseminates through its life, how insect numbers serve up and down, and what kind of weather and location mount these things. This review examines how these relationships hint at disease and pestilence problems, and counts recreational forests as a place where people are open, rather than a different biological environment. Colonization by fungi and oomycetes, bacterial infection, viral replication, defoliation, and bark provisioning each bust a different part of how a tree functions, such as how it grows carbon, moves water, or soaks nutrients. Trees exercise barriers they construct ahead of time, drive chemical defenses only when beset, and even exercise the natural enemies of their attackers. However, how effective these strategies are rides on the health of the tree and how severe the attack is. Studies on sudden oak death denote that the pathogen can ride on shoes and that epidemic it from one place to another is biologically possible. Research on firewood shows that live insects can travel out of wood that has been displaced from one location to another. Neither alone can arbitrate what portion of outbreaks should be chalked up to tourism. The presence of perturbed soil and broke roots brings additional openings for vulnerability, but they are also impressed by the environment. Protection relies on regular checks in the field, careful attention to diagnostic results, vigilance on cleanliness in specific areas where problems might arise, and exercising a combined approach to hack pests effectively. More research is essential to link the movement of propagules with real infections, to estimate how disturbances and climate factors intercourse, and to estimate interventions predicated on their biological effects and ecological impacts.

Keywords: forest pathology; forest entomology; tree physiology; host–pathogen interactions; biological control; recreational biosecurity.

1. Introduction

What makes a forest diverse is not just the trees that are there. Roots compound with microbes, the animals that partake of plant parts, the organisms that break down the plant material, and the environments that form as trees grow old and eventually cease. All these elements pitch in in their own way. Native pathogens and insects are part of this scene, and their presence in a stand does not denote that the stand has been broken. Problems startle when the damage goes too far for the host population to handle, making it hard for them to ride and copycats, which usually happens after an invasion by another species or a change in the environment. The presence of different species also influences how easily an infection can disseminate: when animals that are easy to infect are close together, it's simpler for the infection to hand over from one to another. However, if nearby animals cannot serve as hosts, they may lay over the infection to spread further [1], [2].

Disease and half-pint damage often delay the growth of a tree long before it communicates clear signs of

morbidity. Once parts like leaves, roots, bark, or the tree's internal transport system are injured, the tree changes how it allocates and deploys its resources, and this influences its ability to cope and regrow. The fact that drought and insect attack can work through the same physiological pathways implies that there is rarely a single explanation for decline [3].

Forests that people visit for fun need care, because visitors and the work of fettle trails in shape can convert spores to plants that might not have come into contact with them otherwise. Nonetheless, it would be erroneous to assume that recreational access accounts for all infections occurring near a path. This review constructs the biological reasons, how they spread, and the effects on the environment when forests pick up sick or are beset by pests. It also brackets the impact of tourism, like how people move around and displace the area, with the strength of the evidence confirming these issues. It printed research instead of divulging new findings.

2. Biological Causes of Forest Plant Diseases and Pest Infestations

Forest pathogens are not all the same kind of organism. They contrast in the way they partake, the way they copycat, and the extent to which they depend on functional host cells. Among the fungi, there are those that bring leaf diseases, some that reside in the plant's water transport system, others that bring cankers, and some that bring root decay; certain types grip nutrients from functional cells, while others decimate the tissue first before exercising it. Spores can come from the wind or from water that sloshes around, and some fungi that influence roots disseminate through the roots and through contact between them. Bacteria can pierce the body through cuts or natural openings and then culture in the tissues they detect as suitable for propagating. Viruses replicate inside living cells and disseminate through connections between cells and vascular tissue, riding on vectors or alloyed materials to cover longer distances. Finding a virus does not automatically establish that it causes disease, and unless there is specific evidence from the infected system, viruses should not be categorized as the main causes of tree death [4].

Getting into a host and then culturing inside it are two different challenges. Some pathogens deliver enzymes that assist in disintegrating parts of the cell wall, while others bring a way to menu from cells that they observe alive. Whether colonization chances ride on how the host IDs the invader and on how much the pathogen can bust the host's defenses. Once the virus copycats on the infected tissue, it determines the amount of virus present for the next stage of the epidemic. So, how often an infection occurs, how fast a lesion cultures, and how much chance of sporulation are separate things. They aren’t the same way to measure how aggressive a pathogen is [4].

Oomycetes like *Phytophthora* come across like fungi, but they are part of a different group below the stramenopiles. Water frolics play a key role in their biology. The sporangia can release zoospores that swim around, and special structures assist the organism in surviving tough conditions. *Phytophthora ramorum* shows that being susceptible and having a significant impact in an outbreak should not be the same thing. In a study from California, infected bay laurel leaves were able to deliver inoculum, but the cankers institution on coast live oak served not. A tree might be seriously sick, but not the main reason the disease is epidemic, and neighbors that come across less affected could be assisting the outbreak to endure [5], [6].

Insects can bring various types of injuries predicated on the way they feed. Leaf-eating caterpillars partake of the green parts of plants that lack food, and bark beetles deposit their eggs under the bark, which detrimentally affects the plant's food transport system, often carrying harmful fungi with them. The European spruce bark beetle, *Ips typographus*, communicates that the impact of an attack rides heavily on numbers: when they assemble and bring together, they can pacify defenses that would have been strong enough to lay over just a few of them. The outcome of an outbreak is influenced by factors like the available breeding material, the health of the host, the development stage of the insect, the presence of conspecific microbes, and natural enemies, rather than just the number of individuals present [7].

Colonization occurs only when there are chances of a suitable host, enough exposure, and the right conditions are present. Tree age marks the structure of the bark, how roots form, the amount of damage that has accumulated over time, and the type of tissue available, but this doesn't mean older trees are always more vulnerable than young seedlings. Temperature influences how plants form and copycats, and moisture plays a key role in assisting spores startle to culture, impactful zoospores, and fettle the host plant's water levels in check. Drought does not

influence all areas the same way: how plants react can contrast depending on what is edible and whether the damage comes from main pests or secondary ones. Also, even as water stress adds to it, it doesn't jack up every pest or disease worse [4], [8].

Populations are observed under control by predators, parasitoids, entomopathogenic fungi, and microorganisms that either face off with the pests or directly attempt them. How important these agents are depends on how available the host is, whether their life cycle episodes at the same time, the type of habitat, and the conditions of the microclimate. Natural regulation can be less effective exactly when a pest is rapidly epidemic or the environment is irregular, and depending solely on natural enemies doesn't always keep pest levels below harmful thresholds [7], [9].

3. Effects of Diseases and Pests on Forest Plant Physiology and Ecosystem Function

The order in which the constraints show depends on where the injury is. Lesions on leaves and the loss of foliage degrade the area of the leaf that can perform photosynthesis, and when plants experience water stress, their stomata close, which limits how much carbon they can take in. Root necrosis dents the root's ability to take in water and nutrients, and when certain microbes settle in the plant's vascular system, the blockages they bring can slow the flow of water through the plant. Feeding on bark catches the flow of nutrients between the leaves and the roots. In living tissues, respiration might increase initially as the body brings resources to support and mend itself, but if too much tissue is misplaced, it can eventually slow down the overall metabolic activity of the entire tree. These responses occur in episodes one after another, and their importance makes overcoming the disease [3], [4].

Trees exercise the barriers they naturally hold, along with the responses they bring. The bark structure, resin systems, and phenolic compounds in conifers impede penetration or slow colonization. After an attack, chemicals build up in the area, traumatic resin ducts form, and the tissue can snare the invader in compartments. Defense also touches on how cells fetch and pack signals, not just being a passive structure. Even so, chemical toxicity, how resins run, and how plants construct their defensive tissues contrast between species and depend on their physical state, so knowledge gained from conifer bark can't be directly applicable to broadleaved plants [4], [10].

Damage can disseminate from one organ to another. A lower amount of water makes it harder for plants to perform photosynthesis, and when the movement of carbon is not functioning properly, it can influence the health of the roots, which in turn degrades their ability to take up water and nutrients. Repeated loss of forsakes can drain a tree exercise up its stored energy to foliage, which forsakes less energy for culturing and stuff new seeds. In the other direction, minor damage can be recovered if there are enough resources and enough time to recover. When both drought and bark beetles attack a tree, it might be too much for the tree to recover, but to elucidate the tree conked because of these factors, hypodermic needle proof of how and how strongly each stressor came in order [3].

The effects on reproduction can be evident prior to death. Less assimilation or weaker transport can condition how much a tree can dispose into flowers, cones and seeds, and damage to these reproductive parts directly degrades the output. Seedlings hold different challenges because their small root systems and limited stored energy make it hard for them to recover after mislaying roots or being denuded of leaves multiple times. Focusing only on the mature canopy may command changes in the population dynamics that arbitrate if a forest endures to live [3], [4].

At the population level, mislaying seedlings or reproductive trees repeatedly neuter how new plants are established and arbitrate where future host plants will grow. Death that affects certain species can modify the makeup of the tree layer, the amount of shade, and the resources available to other living things. Biological disturbance also leaves behind deadwood and brings spatial heterogeneity. To preserve the functioning of an ecosystem, it is not necessary to close out native pathogens, insects, or dead trees; rather, it is important to discern their ecological roles from impacts that are excessively severe or caused by an invader. The disease triangle, which contains a susceptible host, a strong pathogen, and a favorable environment, helps explain why just keeping a pathogen doesn't always mean the disease will be severe. Host density and identity also play a role: combining different plants can reduce the harm by specialized insects, but this effect depends on how varied the plant diet is and which species are common. Diversity functions as a resistance strategy that rides on the situation rather than being a

consistent obstacle. In a similar way, alternative hosts can sometimes assist in observing a pathogen alive, as exhibited by the difference between bay laurel and badly infected oaks [1], [4], [5].

4. Biological Risks in Forests Used for Tourism

A full transmission path claims picking up the pathogen, impacting it, uncorking it, riding, and encountering a vulnerable host in conditions that permit infection or the pathogen to gain a hold. Davidson et al. [5] recaptured *P. ramorum* disseminates through soil contaminated by hikers' shoes during the rainy season, and it was shown how the infection displaces from alloyed soil to green leaf litter and then to the leaves of young seedlings. These observations denote that their chances a possible way this could episode; they don't describe to us exactly how many existing infections were converted in by visitors. Cushman and Meentemeyer [11] found that bustling patterns compounded to trails that match how humans disseminate, but an observation-predicated study like that can't rule out all possible environmental influences or variations in how easy it is to hand over certain areas.

Firewood is a different vehicle. Bark and wood furnish shelter for young insects as they are conveyed, permitting their development to endure once they hand over a new location. Jacobi et al. In 2012, they expressed live insects from firewood picked up at a store, which is more convincing proof of the wood conveying insects than just judgment holes in it. Recreational firewood can carry farther than usual local spread, but for an invasion to be successful, it also inevitably needs the right hosts, the ability to ride, and the chance to copycats. Research findings contrast riding on the region and the type of species considered, which implies that any risk assessment can only apply to a limited extent [12].

Soil attached to tires, bicycles, tools, or other equipment can be a routine means for the target organism to disseminate, wherever it is present in that material. Even so, evidence for one pathogen and one carrier should not be used to conclude all forest pests. Tourism should not be treated the same as the broader movement of nursery stock. The trade in live plants is separately registered as a significant way that pests or diseases can pierce new areas, and it can also introduce infected plants to public parks and recreational areas [6], [13].

Recreation can modify host conditions as well. Trampling and trails can jackleg the soil, disturb roots, harm young plants, and modify how water runs through the area. Trees that are vulnerable may be more susceptible to infection due to poor aeration and injured roots, and a lack of regeneration can hinder recovery, even in the absence of a pathogen. These links are scientifically reasonable, but keeping evidence of recreational use doesn't exhibit that disease cases are aggrandizing. Wet conditions might hint at the movement of dirty soil and amplify the activity of oomycetes, while drought can make certain stress–pathogen relationships more intense. The overall impact is inevitably to be assessed for each pathogen individually instead of being generalized, because not all types of disturbance lead to higher infection rates [8], [14][8].

5. Biological Monitoring, Prevention, and Forest Protection

Monitoring should discern between symptoms, which are the host's reaction, and the signs that indicate the organism is harmful. Crown thinning, chlorosis, wilting, resin bleeding, and slower growth all offer us some clues, but they often don't point to a specific problem. Fruiting bodies, distinct galleries, frass, and recognizable insects furnish more direct evidence, even though different agents often show together. Repeated surveys should document the host species, its size or age group, which organs are affected, how symptoms form over time, and any recent environmental stress factors. This assists in interpreting the results in a biological context rather than just predicated on what is described [4].

Diagnostic sampling must be concluded by checking where the possible cause of the problem is located. Different parts like the edges of the broken area, the infected fine roots, the sick leaves, the insects, and the environment all require different ways to collect samples. Microscopy and culture methods exhibit the organism's shape and whether it is still alive, but only if the organism can be grown in a lab. Targeted molecular tests can determine organisms with great accuracy, whereas metabarcoding aims at a wider range of species. In surveillance for airborne fungi [15], it was shown that it was able to detect a broader range of taxa, but specific quantitative PCR was developed to be more sensitive. Neither approach dispenses with the need for proper sampling, authenticated reference sequences, and checks for contamination; DNA by itself cannot establish that an organism is alive,

arbitrate how much it contributes to bringing infection, or show that it was the actual cause. Negative results can be due to hypodermic needle contamination too. An organism can be missed by means of patchy colonization, low inoculum abundance, sampling at the wrong time of year, or substances that hinder amplification. Creating copies of the sample, exercising proper controls, and additional testing methods can assist growers with this uncertainty. If a test observes an imminent back negative, it doesn't necessarily imply the infection isn't present [4], [15].

The use of a surveillance design links high-exposure sites with similar reference areas and habitual observations throughout the seasons. Linking lab results with the symptoms a host communicates later helps describe the difference between an organism that was just present without infection and one that has gripped hold in the body. Maps must expose the locations of susceptible hosts and the locations where pathogens have been bustling, and if this is not concluded, a change in detection frequency may be due to sampling effort, host distribution, or seasonal sporulation, rather than a change in risk [11].

Integrated pest management integrates the process of diagnosing the pest, estimating the level of the population or disease, and taking action that halves the severity of the problem. Keeping predators, parasitoids, and harmful microbes in check can assist in attacking the hosts and their environments more effectively. Microbial biological control can be achieved by facing off with pathogens, delivering substances that inhibit them, acting as parasites, or assisting the host plant to form resistance. However, even if these microbes suppress pathogens in lab tests, it doesn’t imply they will effectively control diseases in a whole forest. Any candidate agent inevitably to be evaluated for how specific it is to its host, how long it remains effective, how well it works, and how it influences other organisms that aren't the target. Similarly, aggrandizing the variety of native tree species should capitalize on selecting trees that work well together and align with local environmental objectives, instead of claiming that any mix of trees will automatically preclude all pests [1], [9].

Prevention should disrupt the cycle that disseminates the risk. Removing stuck soil before impacting anything, eviscerating exercising methods that bring against the pathogen, heading off the spread of infected plant parts, and picking up firewood that's from nearby or has been properly refined each cover a separate way to hack the issue. Cleaning should not touch contaminated soil or wash water near plants that are sensitive to contamination. When the case is strong enough, accommodating access during specific times of the year can lower exposure during periods that are most likely to disseminate the disease. The biology of the target organism and the habitat it furnishes should be estimated when, or before, breeding material. Success should be considered by factors like lower use of transport that isn't very effective, less spread of infections, or smaller harmful populations, rather than by the presence of hygiene facilities [5], [7], [12].

6. Conclusion

Biological risk in forests comes from how things intercourse with each other, not just from individual factors. How a pathogen picks up food and reproduces determines if it can grip onto tissue and how much of it can culture; how many insects there are and how many of them live influences the damage they bring; the protections and strength of the host determine if the damage stays in one place or leads to bigger problems. Environmental conditions influence each stage, and the impact on the ecosystem rides on which hosts are misplaced and if new ones can displace them in time. Keeping forests healthy means we use a hypodermic needle to capitalize on how plants interact and how they compound with each other in nature, not just on what we can feel [3], [4].

Tourism can hint at specific problems like more transport and disruption, but it doesn't cause forest diseases in all cases. The presence of active germs on shoes and resident bugs in firewood implies that efforts should capitalize on specific ways these things disseminate. However, the link institution along trails and the possible ways stress influences roots import we should be more careful and not leap to conclusions. The main goals of the research are to compound carrier contamination with infection or the spread of reproduction, to determine whether recreational activities are changes separate from what changes in hosts or because of climate changes, and to bill if biological control methods and hygiene practices bring in real-world settings. Longitudinal studies that cover both the health of the host, the identification of organisms, and the results in the ecosystem can assist in forecasting changes better, while ensuring they do not displace the natural processes of the forest [5], [8], [9]

Author Contributions

The sole author is responsible for conceptualizing, collecting, and analyzing data, and writing and editing the manuscript.

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

Funding

This research received no external funding.

References

[1] Jactel, H., Moreira, X., & Castagneyrol, B. (2021). Tree diversity and forest resistance to insect pests: patterns, mechanisms, and prospects. *Annual Review of Entomology*, *66*(1), 277-296. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-ento-041720-075234

[2] Keesing, F., & Ostfeld, R. S. (2024). The more, the healthier: Tree diversity reduces forest pests and pathogens. *PLoS Biology*, *22*(2), e3002525. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.3002525

[3] Anderegg, W. R., Hicke, J. A., Fisher, R. A., Allen, C. D., Aukema, J., Bentz, B., & Zeppel, M. (2015). Tree mortality from drought, insects, and their interactions in a changing climate. *New Phytologist*, *208*(3), 674-683. https://doi.org/10.1111/nph.13477

[4] Agrios, G. N. (2005). *Plant pathology*. Elsevier.

[5] Davidson, J. M., Wickland, A. C., Patterson, H. A., Falk, K. R., & Rizzo, D. M. (2005). Transmission of Phytophthora ramorum in mixed-evergreen forest in California. *Phytopathology*, *95*(5), 587-596. https://doi.org/10.1094/PHYTO-95-0587

[6] Grünwald, N. J., Goss, E. M., & Press, C. M. (2008). Phytophthora ramorum: a pathogen with a remarkably wide host range causing sudden oak death on oaks and ramorum blight on woody ornamentals. *Molecular Plant Pathology*, *9*(6), 729-740. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1364-3703.2008.00500.x

[7] Biedermann, P. H., Müller, J., Grégoire, J. C., Gruppe, A., Hagge, J., Hammerbacher, A., & Bässler, C. (2019). Bark beetle population dynamics in the Anthropocene: challenges and solutions. *Trends in ecology & evolution*, *34*(10), 914-924. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2019.06.002

[8] Jactel, H., Petit, J., Desprez-Loustau, M. L., Delzon, S., Piou, D., Battisti, A., & Koricheva, J. (2012). Drought effects on damage by forest insects and pathogens: a meta-analysis. *Global Change Biology*, *18*(1), 267-276. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2486.2011.02512.x

[9] Balla, A., Silini, A., Cherif-Silini, H., Chenari Bouket, A., Moser, W. K., Nowakowska, J. A., & Belbahri, L. (2021). The threat of pests and pathogens and the potential for biological control in forest ecosystems. *Forests*, *12*(11), 1579. https://doi.org/10.3390/f12111579

[10] Franceschi, V. R., Krokene, P., Christiansen, E., & Krekling, T. (2005). Anatomical and chemical defenses of conifer bark against bark beetles and other pests. *New Phytologist*, *167*(2), 353-376. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-8137.2005.01436.x

[11] Cushman, J. H., & Meentemeyer, R. K. (2008). Multi-scale patterns of human activity and the incidence of an exotic forest pathogen. *Journal of Ecology*, *96*(4), 766-776. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2745.2008.01376.x

[12] Solano, A., Rodriguez, S. L., Greenwood, L., Dodds, K. J., & Coyle, D. R. (2021). Firewood transport as a vector of forest pest dispersal in North America: A scoping review. Journal of Economic Entomology, 114(1), 14-23. https://doi.org/10.1093/jee/toaa278

[13] Liebhold, A. M., Brockerhoff, E. G., Garrett, L. J., Parke, J. L., & Britton, K. O. (2012). Live plant imports: the major pathway for forest insect and pathogen invasions of the US. Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment, 10(3), 135-143. https://doi.org/10.1890/110198

[14] Pickering, C. M., Hill, W., Newsome, D., & Leung, Y. F. (2010). Comparing hiking, mountain biking and horse-riding impacts on vegetation and soils in Australia and the United States of America. Journal of Environmental Management, 91(3), 551-562. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2009.09.025

[15] Chandelier, A., Hulin, J., San Martin, G., Debode, F., & Massart, S. (2021). Comparison of qPCR and metabarcoding methods as tools for the detection of airborne inoculum of forest fungal pathogens. Phytopathology, 111(3), 570-581. https://doi.org/10.1094/PHYTO-02-20-0034

[16] Jacobi, W. R., Hardin, J. G., Goodrich, B. A., & Cleaver, C. M. (2012). Retail firewood can transport live tree pests. *Journal of Economic Entomology*, *105*(5), 1645-1658. https://doi.org/10.1603/EC12069