

See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/225761454>

Tree invasions: A comparative test of the dominant hypotheses and functional traits

Article in *Biological Invasions* · September 2011

DOI: 10.1007/s10530-011-0015-x

CITATIONS

136

READS

484

3 authors, including:



[Laurent J. Lamarque](#)

Université du Québec à Trois-Rivières

48 PUBLICATIONS 1,087 CITATIONS

[SEE PROFILE](#)



[Sylvain Delzon](#)

French National Institute for Agriculture, Food, and Environment (INRAE)

259 PUBLICATIONS 17,288 CITATIONS

[SEE PROFILE](#)

Some of the authors of this publication are also working on these related projects:



Ecology and evolution of invasive maple trees [View project](#)



TREEPEACE :From Holocen to Anthropocen the pace of microevolution in trees. <http://treepeace.eu/> [View project](#)

Tree invasions: a comparative test of the dominant hypotheses and functional traits

Laurent Jean Lamarque · Sylvain Delzon ·
Christopher James Lortie

Received: 7 September 2009 / Accepted: 30 April 2011
© Springer Science+Business Media B.V. 2011

Abstract Trees act as ecosystem engineers and invasions by exotic tree species profoundly impact recipient communities. Recently, research on invasive trees has dramatically increased, enabling the assessment of general trends in tree invasion. Analysing 90 studies dealing with 45 invasive tree species, we conducted a quantitative review and a meta-analysis to estimate the relevance of eight leading hypotheses for explaining tree invasions. We also tested whether species functional traits (growth rate, density/cover, germination, biomass and survival) equally promote tree invasiveness. Overall, our results suggest that several hypotheses, linked to invasibility or invasiveness, are pertinent to explain tree invasions. Furthermore, more than one hypothesis has been supported for a given species, which indicates that multiple factors lead to the success of invasive tree species. In addition, growth rate appears to be the most efficient predictor of invasiveness for invasive trees and could thus be used as a means to identify potential alien tree invasions. We conclude that further investigations are needed to test the consistency of some hypotheses across a broader pool of invasive tree species, whilst experimental

studies with the same tree species across a larger range of sites would help to reveal the full suite of factors that affect tree invasions.

Keywords Tree invasion · Systematic review · Meta-analysis · Invasiveness · Invasibility · Functional traits

Introduction

Over the last few decades, biological invasions have become a pressing topic in ecology and evolution, particularly in population biology, community ecology, restoration, and conservation biology (Sakai et al. 2001; Callaway and Maron 2006). Their negative impacts on recipient communities include alteration of successional dynamics over time, reduction of diversity and relative abundance of native species, disruption of important ecosystem functions as well as strong economical costs induced to limit their proliferation (Inderjit 2005). Virtually no places are immune from changes related to invasions (Mack et al. 2000).

As described by Wardle (2002), community and ecosystem processes are controlled by keystone species. In forests, trees play the role of ecosystem engineers and regulate ecosystem functions (Reich et al. 2001; Crooks 2002; Belote and Jones 2009). Consequently, ecosystem invasions by woody species can lead to serious changes in community functions, altering primary production, biomass distribution,

L. J. Lamarque · C. J. Lortie
Department of Biology, York University, 4700 Keele
Street, Toronto, ON M3J 1P3, Canada

L. J. Lamarque · S. Delzon (✉)
UMR BIOGECO, University of Bordeaux, INRA,
Talence, France
e-mail: sylvain.delzon@u-bordeaux1.fr

litterfall and decomposition rates, energy balance or carbon storage (Richardson and Higgins 1998; Jackson et al. 2002; Yelenik et al. 2004). For instance, Australian *Acacia* spp. account for the most significant declines in native species richness in the Fynbos Biome of South Africa (see Richardson and van Wilgen 2004 for review; Gaertner et al. 2009), whilst *Tamarix* spp. prevent natural flood regimes and deepen local water tables in the Southwestern USA (Randall 1993, 1996).

Growing concern about tree invasions in recent decades has promoted their adoption as a suitable model to understand invasion processes in general (Richardson and Bond 1991; Krivanek and Pysek 2006; Richardson 2006; Pysek et al. 2009). While a recent review presents evidence for 357 tree species being invasive in at least one region of the world (Richardson and Rejmanek, in press), studies have predominantly featured conifer tree invasions in the Southern Hemisphere (Richardson et al. 1994; Higgins et al. 1996; Richardson 1998; Simberloff et al. 2010) and broadleaved deciduous tree invasions in the Northern Hemisphere (Keay et al. 2000; Rogers and Siemann 2002; Chabrierie et al. 2008; Cincotta et al. 2009). In addition, invasions by tree species have been investigated through the use of multiple functional traits such as survival and herbivory resistance, germination, growth, biomass accumulation, density and abundance (Siemann and Rogers 2001; Chaneton et al. 2004). Consequently, the capacity now exists to quantitatively assess the literature on invasive trees and to determine general trends such as which functional traits are determinants of tree invasiveness, which community-level attributes promote tree invasions, and which research gaps should be addressed in subsequent studies (Rejmánek 1996; Rejmánek and Richardson 1996).

Several hypotheses have been postulated to explain the success of introduced plants (Hierro et al. 2005). They focus either on community, habitat or ecosystem-level properties that relate to the susceptibility to invasion (invasibility, Williamson 1996; Lonsdale 1999) or on species life-history traits that promote successful colonization of exotics (invasiveness, Williamson and Fitter 1996). Specifically, invasibility is defined as the features of the environment or components of a community that determine its vulnerability to invasion, while invasiveness refers to the features of an alien organism, such as its life-history traits and mode of reproduction, that define its capacity to invade (Sakai et al. 2001; Erfmeier and Bruehlheide 2010; Richardson

et al. 2011). A species may become invasive (1) if its entry in the community is facilitated by native species (theory of facilitation; Bruno et al. 2003), (2) if natural or anthropogenic disturbances affect the community (disturbance hypothesis; Mack et al. 2000) or (3) when fluctuating resources through time and space (theory of fluctuating resource availability; Davis et al. 2000) or vacant niches (empty niche hypothesis; Mack 1996; Levine and D'Antonio 1999) are available. On the other hand, functional traits have been extensively studied as a means to potentially predict invasiveness (Sakai et al. 2001). For instance, some exotic grass and tree species have been found to produce high numbers of seeds (propagule pressure hypothesis; Williamson and Fitter 1996; Lonsdale 1999) or to use allelopathic compounds towards native species (novel weapons hypothesis; Callaway and Aschehoug 2000). Escaping from natural enemies, plant species can also exhibit a rapid increase in distribution and abundance (enemy release hypothesis; Keane and Crawley 2002) whilst evolutionary changes may occur as plants reallocate their resources previously reserved for defense to growth and reproduction (evolution of increased competitive ability hypothesis; Blossey and Notzold 1995). Initially proposed for weedy invasions into grasslands (Maron and Vila 2001), these mechanisms may also apply to tree invasions.

Quantitative reviews have the capacity to provide a means of assessing progress to date in studying invasions and highlighting gaps in research. Such an approach applied to invasive trees would offer both a broad picture of the importance of tree invasions in forest systems and an assessment of the effectiveness of the set of studies available to date. Here, we incorporated a formal systematic review together with meta-analytical statistics to assess the following questions in the specific context of invasive tree species: (1) Do hypotheses linked to invasiveness or invasibility equally contribute to explaining tree invasions? (2) Is the success of a given invasive tree species explained by one or more hypotheses? (3) Which functional traits are the best determinants of tree invasiveness?

We used the standardized terminology recommended by Richardson et al. (2000) to define species' invasion status. In this study, an 'invasive' species is a naturalized alien (synonyms: exotic, non-native) plant that produces reproductive offspring in very large numbers at considerable distances from parents

plants, and thus have the potential to spread over a considerable area (Richardson et al. 2000; Pysek et al. 2004). Similarly, ‘invasion success’ refers here to species that have been successful in both establishing and spreading in areas beyond their native range, which is an opportunity limited to a small fraction of introduced taxa (Richardson et al. 2000; Williamson 2006; Blackburn and Jeschke 2009). We included in this study tree species only, defined as in Richardson and Rejmanek (in press). For inclusion in this study, articles had to focus on invasive tree species and effectively tested at least one of the eight dominant invasion hypotheses.

Materials and methods

Systematic review

This systematic review focused on the eight most common hypotheses associated with invasive species in general. Four of these are linked to the invasiveness concept, the enemy release (ER) hypothesis (Keane and Crawley 2002), the evolution of increased competitive ability (EICA) hypothesis (Blossey and Notzold 1995), the novel weapons (NW) hypothesis (Callaway and Aschehoug 2000) and the propagule pressure (PP) hypothesis (Williamson and Fitter 1996; Lonsdale 1999), while four are encapsulated in the invasibility concept, the empty niche (EN) hypothesis (Levine and D’Antonio 1999), the theory of fluctuation of resource availability (FRA) (Davis et al. 2000), the theory of facilitation (Bruno et al. 2003) and the disturbance hypothesis (Mack et al. 2000). Using the Web of Science (ISI) electronic bibliographic database, an extensive literature survey was conducted through a set of key words including ‘enemy release’, ‘competitive ability’, ‘allelopathy’, ‘propagule pressure’, ‘niche hypothesis’, ‘fluctuating resource’, ‘facilitation’, and ‘disturbance hypothesis’. Observational, experimental and modelling studies were included provided they focused on factors associated with promoting invasions. However, modelling studies that mapped plant population distributions in their invasive ranges were excluded from the set of studies used in the formal meta-analyses since they did not explicitly test hypotheses. Publications were then classified as follows: how many (a) cited each

hypothesis, (b) tested it in practical terms on plant invasions, and (c) tested it on invasive tree species. All the articles that were listed on the Science Citation Index as of early November 2010 and that met the inclusion criteria were included. A vote-counting method was used to assess the success of testing each hypothesis on invasive trees (Gates 2002).

Meta-analyses

Using the pool of experimental and observational publications from the systematic review which focused on invasive trees, we performed two meta-analyses: one on the hypotheses tested and one on the main functional traits measured in tree invasion ecology and linked to invasiveness. Because it takes into account the effect of small sample sizes (Hedges and Olkin 1985; Rosenberg et al. 2000), Hedges’ unbiased standardized mean difference (Hedges’ d) was used as the metric of effect size for both meta-analyses. Hence, studies were included only if a measure of the sample size and the error term of the mean values were available for both control and treatment groups. These values were obtained either from text, tables, or graphs. Data published in graph form were extracted using TechDig 2.0 software (Jones 1998). Mean, sample size and error term data which were not provided in the publications nor obtained by contacting the authors were excluded from the analyses.

In the first meta-analysis, performed to assess whether the leading hypotheses for plant invasion are all relevant to explain the success of invasive trees, control and treatment groups used for effect size calculations in a publication were determined to be in accordance with the hypothesis tested (see “Appendix 1”). Accordingly, we changed the sign of the effect sizes for the studies related to the novel weapons hypothesis because negative values of the effect sizes actually indicated an inhibitory effect of the invasive species on the native neighbours. Moreover, in order to avoid pseudo-replication, effect sizes in a publication were pooled per species and per hypothesis tested, and we thus used the pooled mean effect size and the mean variance (Leimu et al. 2006; van Kleunen et al. 2010). Therefore, the final data set included 63 studies reported in 58 publications that encompassed 26 invasive tree species (Table 1).

Table 1 List of articles that effectively tested one of the eight dominant invasion hypotheses on invasive tree species

References	Invasive tree species	Study location	Hypothesis ^a	Trait ^b
Adams et al. (2009) ^{†,§}	<i>Acer platanoides</i>	North America and Europe	ER	S
Alston and Richardson (2006)	<i>Acacia</i> spp., <i>Eriobotrya japonica</i> , <i>Homolanthus populifolius</i> , <i>Paraserianthes lophantha</i> , <i>Pinus</i> spp., <i>Pittosporum undulatum</i> , <i>Populus × canescens</i> , <i>Quercus robur</i> , <i>Solanum mauritanium</i>	South Africa	D	–
Barton et al. (2004)	<i>Acer platanoides</i> , <i>Rhamnus cathartica</i>	USA	PP	–
Battaglia et al. (2009)	<i>Sapium sebiferum</i>	USA	F	–
Bellingham et al. (2005) ^{†,§}	<i>Pittosporum undulatum</i>	Jamaica	EN	DC
Belote et al. (2008)	<i>Ailanthus altissima</i>	USA	EN	–
Carvalho et al. (2010) ^{†,§}	<i>Acacia longifolia</i>	Portugal	D	B
Chabrierie et al. (2008)	<i>Prunus serotina</i>	France	D	–
Chaneton et al. (2004) ^{†,§}	<i>Gleditsia triacanthos</i>	Argentina	D	B, Ge, S
Cincotta et al. (2009) ^{†,§}	<i>Acer platanoides</i>	USA	ER	B, S
Conway et al. (2002)	<i>Sapium sebiferum</i>	USA	NW	–
Dezotti et al. (2009)	<i>Pinus ponderosa</i> , <i>Pinus radiata</i>	Argentina	PP	–
Donnelly and Walters (2008) [†]	<i>Schinus terebinthifolius</i>	USA	PP	DC, Ge, S
Donnelly et al. (2008) [†]	<i>Schinus terebinthifolius</i>	USA	NW	B, Gr
Franks et al. (2008a) ^{†,§}	<i>Melaleuca quinquenervia</i>	USA	EICA	B, Gr
Franks et al. (2008b)	<i>Melaleuca quinquenervia</i>	USA	EICA	–
Green et al. (2004) [†]	<i>Adenantha pavonia</i>	Australia	ER	B, Gr
Gurevitch et al. (2008)	<i>Acer platanoides</i> , <i>Prunus serotina</i>	USA	FRA	–
Heimpel et al. (2010)	<i>Rhamnus cathartica</i>	USA	F	–
Higgins and Richardson (1998)	<i>Pinus radiata</i> , <i>Pinus strobus</i>	South Africa	D	–
Higgins et al. (1996)	<i>Pinus</i> spp.	South Africa	PP	–
Howard et al. (2004)	<i>Ailanthus altissima</i> , <i>Robinia pseudo-acacia</i>	USA	EN	–
Huang et al. (2010) ^{†,§}	<i>Sapium sebiferum</i>	USA	EICA	–
Iponga et al. (2009a) [†]	<i>Schinus molle</i>	South Africa	PP	–
Iponga et al. (2009b) [†]	<i>Schinus molle</i>	South Africa	F and ER	–
Iponga et al. (2010) [†]	<i>Schinus molle</i>	South Africa	F	–
Kaproth and McGraw (2008) [†]	<i>Ailanthus altissima</i>	USA	PP	–
Keay et al. (2000)	<i>Sapium sebiferum</i>	USA	NW	–
Knapp et al. (2008) ^{†,§}	<i>Acer platanoides</i> ,	USA	ER	Gr, S
Knight and Reich (2005)	<i>Rhamnus cathartica</i>	USA	EN	–
Knight et al. (2008)	<i>Prunus serotina</i>	Poland	EN	–

Table 1 continued

References	Invasive tree species	Study location	Hypothesis ^a	Trait ^b
Krivanek et al. (2006)	<i>Acer negundo</i> , <i>Ailanthus altissima</i> , <i>Padus serotina</i> , <i>Pinus strobus</i> , <i>Quercus rubra</i> , <i>Robinia pseudo-acacia</i>	Czech Republic	PP	-
Kuppinger et al. (2010)	<i>Paulownia tomentosa</i>	USA	D	-
Lankau et al. (2004) ^{‡,§}	<i>Sapium sebiferum</i>	USA	ER	B, S
Leger et al. (2007) [§]	<i>Acer platanoides</i>	USA	FRA	B
Lesica and DeLuca (2004) [‡]	<i>Tamarix ramosissima</i>	USA	NW	Gr
Liu et al. (2007) ^{‡,§}	<i>Eugenia uniflora</i>	USA	ER	Ge, S
Lockhart et al. (1999) [‡]	<i>Melaleuca quinquenervia</i>	USA	FRA	-
Lorenzo et al. (2008) [‡]	<i>Acacia dealbata</i>	Spain	NW	-
Lorenzo et al. (2010a) ^{‡,§}	<i>Acacia dealbata</i>	Spain	NW	Ge, Gr
Lorenzo et al. (2010b)	<i>Acacia dealbata</i>	Spain	NW	-
Martin and Canham (2010) ^{‡,§}	<i>Acer platanoides</i> , <i>Ailanthus altissima</i>	USA	PP	DC
Martin and Marks (2006) [‡]	<i>Acer platanoides</i>	USA	FRA	-
Mazia et al. (2001) [‡]	<i>Gleditsia triacanthos</i> , <i>Prosopis caldenia</i>	Argentina	D	-
Mazia et al. (2010) ^{‡,§}	<i>Gleditsia triacanthos</i>	Argentina	D	S
McCay and McCay (2009) ^{‡,§}	<i>Rhamnus cathartica</i>	USA	PP	DC, S
Milton et al. (2007)	<i>Prosopis</i> sp., <i>Schinus molle</i>	South Africa	PP	-
Morgan and Overholt (2005) [‡]	<i>Schinus terebinthifolius</i>	USA	NW	-
Morrison and Mauck (2007) ^{‡,§}	<i>Acer platanoides</i>	USA	ER	B, Gr, S
Nasir et al. (2005) [‡]	<i>Robinia pseudo-acacia</i>	Japon	NW	-
Nijjer et al. (2007) ^{‡,§}	<i>Sapium sebiferum</i>	USA	F	B, Gr, S
Nunez et al. (2008)	<i>Pinus ponderosa</i> , <i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Argentina	F	-
Ohlemüller et al. (2006)	-	New Zealand	EN	-
Peperkorn et al. (2005) ^{‡,§}	<i>Acacia longifolia</i>	Germany	FRA	B, Gr
Reinhart and Callaway (2004) ^{‡,§}	<i>Acer negundo</i> , <i>Acer platanoides</i>	USA and France	ER	B, Gr
Reinhart et al. (2003) ^{‡,§}	<i>Prunus serotina</i>	USA and The Netherlands	ER	B
Reinhart et al. (2005) ^{‡,§}	<i>Acer platanoides</i>	USA	F	B, Gr
Reinhart et al. (2006) [‡]	<i>Acer platanoides</i>	USA	F	-
Reinhart et al. (2010) ^{‡,§}	<i>Prunus serotina</i>	Belgium	ER	B, S
Relva et al. (2010) ^{‡,§}	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Argentina	F	DC, Gr
Reynolds and Cooper (2010) [§]	<i>Elaeagnus angustifolia</i>	USA	F	Gr
Richardson and Bond (1991)	<i>Pinus</i> spp.	South Africa	D	-
Richardson et al. (1994)	<i>Pinu</i> spp.	South Africa	D	-

Table 1 continued

References	Invasive tree species	Study location	Hypothesis ^a	Trait ^b
Rogers and Siemann (2002) ^{‡,§}	<i>Sapium sebiferum</i>	USA	ER	Gr
Rogers and Siemann (2003) [‡]	<i>Sapium sebiferum</i>	USA	ER	–
Rogers and Siemann (2004) ^{‡,§}	<i>Sapium sebiferum</i>	USA	EICA	B, Gr
Rogers and Siemann (2005) ^{‡,§}	<i>Sapium sebiferum</i>	USA	EICA	B, Gr
Rouget and Richardson (2003)	<i>Acacia saligna</i> , <i>Acacia cyclops</i> , <i>Pinus pinaster</i>	South Africa	PP	–
Rouget et al. (2001)	<i>Pinus canariensis</i> , <i>Pinus halepensis</i> , <i>Pinus pinaster</i> , <i>Pinus radiata</i>	South Africa	D	–
Saccone et al. (2010)	<i>Acer negundo</i>	France	F	–
Schumacher et al. (2008) ^{‡,§}	<i>Alstonia macrophylla</i> , <i>Cinnamomum verum</i> , <i>Psidium cattleianum</i> , <i>Syzygium jambos</i> , <i>Tabebuia pallida</i>	Seychelles	FRA	B, Gr
Schumacher et al. (2009) ^{‡,§}	<i>Alstonia macrophylla</i> , <i>Cinnamomum verum</i> , <i>Psidium cattleianum</i> , <i>Sandoricum koetjape</i> , <i>Syzygium jambos</i> , <i>Tabebuia pallida</i>	Seychelles	FRA	B, Gr
Siemann and Rogers (2001) ^{‡,§}	<i>Sapium sebiferum</i>	USA	EICA	Gr
Siemann and Rogers (2003a) ^{‡,§}	<i>Sapium sebiferum</i>	USA	FRA	B
Siemann and Rogers (2003b) ^{‡,§}	<i>Sapium sebiferum</i>	USA	ER	B, Ge, Gr, S
Siemann and Rogers (2003c) ^{‡,§}	<i>Sapium sebiferum</i>	USA	EICA	Gr
Siemann and Rogers (2003d) ^{‡,§}	<i>Sapium sebiferum</i>	USA	EICA	Gr, S
Siemann and Rogers (2006) ^{‡,§}	<i>Sapium sebiferum</i>	USA	ER	Ge, S
Siemann and Rogers (2007) [‡]	<i>Sapium sebiferum</i>	USA	FRA	–
Siemann et al. (2006) ^{‡,§}	<i>Sapium sebiferum</i>	USA	EICA	Gr, S
Siemann et al. (2007) [‡]	<i>Sapium sebiferum</i>	USA	FRA	–
Tecco et al. (2006) ^{‡,§}	<i>Ligustrum lucidum</i>	Argentina	F	DC
Tecco et al. (2007) [‡]	<i>Ligustrum lucidum</i>	Argentina	F	–
Vanhellemont et al. (2009)	<i>Prunus serotina</i>	Belgium	PP	–
Yamashita et al. (2002)	<i>Bischofia javanica</i>	Japan	FRA	–
Zalba et al. (2008)	<i>Pinus halepensis</i>	Argentina	D	–
Zou et al. (2006) ^{‡,§}	<i>Sapium sebiferum</i>	China	EICA	B, Gr, S
Zou et al. (2008a) ^{‡,§}	<i>Sapium sebiferum</i>	China	EICA	B, Gr, S
Zou et al. (2008b) ^{‡,§}	<i>Sapium sebiferum</i>	China	EICA	B, S
Zou et al. (2009) ^{‡,§}	<i>Sapium sebiferum</i>	USA	FRA	B, Gr, DC

For each study, we respectively reported the invasive tree species studied, the study location, the hypothesis tested and the functional traits measured

[‡] Studies included in the meta-analysis conducted on hypotheses. [§] Studies included in the meta-analysis conducted on functional traits

^a Disturbance, *EICA* evolution of increased competitive ability, *EN* empty niche, *ER* enemy release; *F* facilitation, *FRA* fluctuating resource availability, *NW* novel weapons (also called “allelopathy” hypothesis), *PP* propagule pressure

^b Biomass, *Ge* germination, *Gr* growth rate, *DC* density/cover, *S* survival

The second meta-analysis was run to assess whether the functional traits equally promote tree invasiveness. Hence, control and treatment groups used here were mainly based on the comparison (1) between native and invasive populations of the invasive tree species studied or (2) between native species of the introduced range and the invasive tree species (see “Appendix 2”). We only compared functional traits that were widely studied as biomass (plant weight and root-shoot ratio), density/cover (number of trees or seedlings), germination (seed emergence, germination and seedling recruitment), growth rate (height and diameter increment) and survival. Lastly, effect sizes in a publication were pooled per species and per functional trait measured, and the pooled mean effect size and the mean variance were thus used. Consequently, the final data set included 80 studies reported in 41 publications encompassing 21 invasive trees (Table 1).

The meta-analytical calculations were performed using the program MetaWin 2 (Rosenberg et al. 2000). Confidence intervals (CI) of effect sizes were calculated using bootstrap resampling procedures (Adams et al. 1997) with 9999 iterations. The strength and pertinence of hypotheses and functional traits were evaluated according to d values and considered if the 95% biased-corrected bootstrap CI

of the effect size d did not overlap zero (Rosenberg et al. 2000). Data were analyzed using random-effect models as it was assumed that, in addition to sampling error, there is a true random component of variation in effect sizes between studies (Gurevitch et al. 2001). Heterogeneity between hypotheses and between traits was examined with Q -statistics (Hedges and Olkin 1985) while publication bias was explored statistically with Spearman rank correlation test and examination of fail-safe numbers (Rosenberg 2005).

Results

Systematic review

A total of 6,308 articles were published that cited the eight main hypotheses advanced to explain biological invasions (Table 2). Nonetheless, within this set of publications, only 561 (9%) effectively tested these hypotheses on concrete cases of invasion, conducting experiments on invasive animal or plant species and for both terrestrial and aquatic communities. The most tested hypothesis on invasive species in general was the fluctuating resource availability hypothesis (16% of the 561 articles that effectively test any

Table 2 Systematic review based on eight dominant hypotheses proposed to explain the success of invasive species

Hypothesis	Article of reference	Time cited	Time tested on invasive sp	Time tested on invasive tree sp			
				Total	Supported	Mixed	Rejected
D	Mack et al. (2000)	1435	75 (13%)	12 (13%)	12	0	0
EICA	Blossey and Notzold (1995)	452	59 (10%)	12 (13%)	10	0	2
EN	Levine and D’Antonio (1999)	461	68 (12%)	6 (7%)	0	1	5
ER	Keane and Crawley (2002)	722	81 (14%)	14 (16%)	10	1	3
F	Bruno et al. (2003)	670	47 (8%)	13 (14%)	10	2	1
FRA	Davis et al. (2000)	1019	89 (16%)	12 (13%)	11	1	0
NW	Callaway and Aschehoug (2000)	429	73 (13%)	9 (10%)	6	0	3
PP	Lonsdale (1999), Williamson and Fitter (1996)	1120	69 (12%)	12 (13%)	11	1	0
Total		6308	561	90 (16%)	70 (78%)	6	14

For each hypothesis, number of articles that respectively, cited it and tested it on both invasive species in general and invasive tree species in particular. The analysis of articles was conducted using the ISI Web of Science (date of access up to early November 2010). A vote-counting method was applied on the 96 articles that focused on invasive tree species. Percentages presented were calculated in function of the total number of articles of each column

See “Appendix 3” for more information on the invasive tree species studied

D disturbance, *EICA* evolution of increased competitive ability, *EN* empty niche, *ER* enemy release, *F* facilitation, *FRA* fluctuating resource availability, *NW* novel weapons (also called “allelopathy” hypothesis), *PP* propagule pressure

hypothesis) whereas the facilitation hypothesis was the least tested (8%).

For invasive trees, a total of 90 observational and experimental studies concretely tested these hypotheses (Table 1). The most tested hypotheses in tree invasion ecology was the enemy release hypothesis (16% of the 90 articles that effectively test any hypothesis on invasive trees) while the least tested on invasive trees was also the empty niche hypothesis (8%; Table 2). A large proportion (78%) of articles focusing on invasive tree species reported support for the hypothesis they tested (Table 2). The empty niche hypothesis however found no support to explain tree invasions (Table 2; five articles rejected it and one had a mixed result).

A wide range of habitats, mainly open fields, grasslands and forests have been invaded by tree species in both Hemispheres and under temperate, subtropical and tropical climates (see “Appendix 3”). Invasion hypotheses were tested on different taxonomic groups including conifers, broadleaved evergreens and broadleaved deciduous species. Nonetheless, all the hypotheses were not tested in all systems and for example, studies conducted in the Southern Hemisphere on conifer tree invasions predominantly focused on the role of both propagule pressure and disturbance. Overall, there were 45 species of invasive trees from 23 different families studied in the 90 publications. However, invasive tree species were unequally represented among the studies with 17 species reported in only one study (see “Appendix 3”). In contrast, there were 11 articles that focused on conifer tree (Pinaceae family) invasions in the Southern Hemisphere, while in North America, there were 23 and 12 experiments that respectively tested invasion hypotheses on *Sapium sebiferum* (Chinese tallow tree) and *Acer platanoides* (Norway maple).

Meta-analysis on hypotheses tested on invasive trees

The empty niche hypothesis was excluded from the comparison performed between hypotheses because too few studies were conducted to allow us to calculate an effect size. First, the overall weighted-mean effect size of this set of studies was positive ($d = 0.6889$) and significantly different from zero (95% bias-corrected bootstrap CI: 0.4956 to 0.9122; Fig. 1). We did not observe any difference in effect sizes between




Fig. 1 Weighted-mean effect sizes (Hedges' d) and 95% bias-corrected confidence intervals calculated for seven dominant hypotheses proposed to explain invasion in trees (the effect size could not be calculated for the empty niche hypothesis). The number of studies and, in parentheses, the number of invasive tree species they refer to, are given on the left-hand side of the graph; dotted line shows Hedges' $d = 0$. Black and white effect sizes refer respectively to hypotheses linked to invasiveness and invasibility. Abbreviations are as specified in Table 1

hypotheses related to invasibility and the ones linked to invasiveness ($d_{invasiveness} = 0.7073$, $d_{invasibility} = 0.6342$; $Q_{between} = 0.15$, $df = 1$, $P = 0.69$; Fig. 1). However, differences in effect sizes appeared between hypotheses. The novel weapons hypothesis only expressed an effect size greater than 1 ($d_{NW} = 1.7717$). While the propagule pressure and the facilitation hypotheses had also relative large effect sizes ($d_{PP} = 0.9582$, $d_F = 0.9194$), the four other hypotheses showed moderate effect sizes ($d_{EICA} = 0.6469$, $d_D = 0.5647$, $d_{FRA} = 0.4654$ and $d_{ER} = 0.3735$; Fig. 1). Further analysis revealed that the novel weapons hypothesis expressed a significant greater effect size than the other hypotheses ($Q_{between} = 13.31$, $df = 1$, $P = 0.0003$). When running the meta-analysis without studies related to the novel weapons hypothesis, no significant difference was found between effect sizes ($Q_{between} = 5.32$, $df = 5$, $P = 0.38$).

Meta-analysis on functional traits measured in invasive tree studies

The grand mean effect size for all the functional traits was positive ($d = 0.5945$) and significantly different from zero (95% bias-corrected bootstrap CI: 0.3970 to 0.7975; Fig. 2). The heterogeneity of effect sizes was not statistically significant ($Q_{between} = 6.45$, $df = 4$, $P = 0.16$; Fig. 2). Nevertheless, growth rate showed the largest effect size ($d_{growth\ rate} = 0.9217$) while the effect size values were moderate for




Fig. 2 Weighted-mean effect sizes (Hedges' d) and 95% bias-corrected confidence intervals calculated for the five main functional traits used in invasive tree species. The number of studies and, in parentheses, the number of invasive tree species they refer to, are given on the left-hand side of the graph; dotted line shows Hedge's $d = 0$. Significant levels associated with Q -values: *** $P < 0.05$

density/cover, germination, biomass and survival ($d_{density/cover} = 0.5292$, $d_{germination} = 0.4913$, $d_{survival} = 0.4505$ and $d_{biomass} = 0.4046$). Further analysis hence revealed a significant difference between growth rate and the four other functional traits pooled together ($Q_{between} = 6.49$, $df = 1$, $P = 0.01$; Fig. 2). When we re-analysed the studies linked to all the functional traits except growth rate, no significant difference was found between effect sizes ($Q_{between} = 0.19$, $df = 3$, $P = 0.97$).

Publication bias

The inspection of the weighted histogram of effect sizes of the raw data showed no depression around zero and the funnel plot of the effect sizes versus the sample size did not show skewness suggesting no publication bias in reporting results from the studies included in this meta-analysis (Aguilar et al. 2006). The robustness of our results was also supported by Rosenthal's weighted fail-safe number (51,408.4) which was much greater than the number of studies (6840) expected without publication bias (Rosenberg et al. 2000).

Discussion

In this study, a quantitative review and meta-analytical statistics were used to summarize the progress to date in understanding tree invasions. Importantly, seven of the eight hypotheses prevalent in the

grassland invasion literature also apply to invasive tree species. Because it was more often rejected, the empty niche hypothesis may be the least relevant hypothesis. In addition, although all the functional traits tested were identified as determinants of tree invasiveness, growth rate was the most significant. Invasions by trees were explained by the same hypotheses that have been successfully applied to invasive grass species, which suggests that similar processes may function, at least coarsely, in forests and grasslands with respect to factors that promote the success of introduced species.

To date, 90 publications have concretely tested the eight dominant invasion hypotheses on invasive tree species, encompassing a total of 45 non-indigenous tree species that are proliferating in their introduced range. Studies were mostly conducted in South Africa on conifer and evergreen trees and in North America on invasive deciduous trees. Most of these studies (69) were published within the last 5 years, which clearly indicates the growing interest for invasive trees within plant invasion ecology. However, all the tree species were not equally studied and some tree species dominate the literature to date, which can partially explain the geographical and taxonomic biases in invasion ecology highlighted by Pysek et al. (2008). *Pinus* and *Acacia* spp. invasions into grasslands and shrublands represent the most extensive research on invasive trees in the Southern Hemisphere (Higgins and Richardson 1998; Rouget et al. 2001; Alston and Richardson 2006; Dezzotti et al. 2009) while in North America, broadleaved deciduous *Acer platanoides* invasion into forests and *Sapium sebiferum* invasion into coastal prairies feature the dominant cases of invasive trees studied in the Northern Hemisphere (Conway et al. 2002; Barton et al. 2004; Morrison and Mauck 2007; Battaglia et al. 2009). Consequently, more research efforts on a broader pool of invasive trees are still necessary to fully understand the broad processes that promote tree invasions, particularly since 357 tree species are considered invasive in at least one region of the world (Richardson and Rejmanek, in press).

Hypotheses linked to invasiveness and the ones linked to invasibility equally contribute to explaining tree invasions. With the exception of the empty niche hypothesis (see below), the systematic review revealed that the dominant hypotheses for plant invasions were successfully tested on invasive trees

(100% for invasiveness hypotheses and 75% for invasibility hypotheses), whilst the meta-analysis conducted on the hypotheses similarly showed that they all generated significant positive effect sizes. These findings lead to two key conclusions. First, tree invasions cannot be explained by a single hypothesis and are likely related to changes in several biological factors in the invaded habitats. Indeed, invasiveness and invasibility interact in trees to promote invasion processes (Richardson and Pysek 2006). Hence, the success of invasive trees appears to be context-dependent. For instance, species adapted to high resource availability are also those most affected by natural enemies in their native range (Blumenthal 2006; Blumenthal et al. 2009). When introduced to a new region, they benefit more from both enemy release and resource availability than well-defended species adapted to low resource availability (Blumenthal 2005). Second, several hypotheses were successfully tested on the same invasive tree species, which further suggests that no one mechanism may fully explain invasion into forests. For instance, in the case of *Sapinum sebiferum* in wetland and upland habitats of the United States, studies suggested that various mechanisms such as loss of natural enemies, evolutionary shifts in resource allocation, use of allelopathic components and changes in light and nitrogen availability may promote its high and ongoing invasion of grasslands (Siemann and Rogers 2003b, 2007; Zou et al. 2008a, 2009). Evidence from these experiments supports recent findings that species attributes and attributes of recipient communities interact during plant invasion events (Krivanek et al. 2006; Pysek and Richardson 2007; Pysek et al. 2009).

However, all the hypotheses might not equally explain tree invasions. Results from the systematic review showed that the majority of the studies supported the hypothesis they tested, except for the empty niche hypothesis. Given that no single study reported support for it (Howard et al. 2004; Belote et al. 2008), the empty niche hypothesis is the least relevant hypothesis for invasive tree success. This may be due to the concept of empty niche itself. With local and regional factors as determinants of forest invasibility (Knight and Reich 2005; Ohlemüller et al. 2006), the empty niche hypothesis seems too vague and less precisely defined than the ideas supported by the other hypotheses. Nonetheless, few

studies only tested this hypothesis on invasive trees to date, which prevented us from including it in the meta-analysis, and consequently, more research is crucial to test its consistency. Conversely, the novel weapons hypothesis, which showed a very large positive effect size, suggests that tree invasion is successful when exotic trees are able to release allelopathic compounds, as shown for *Sapinum sebiferum* in North America and *Acacia dealbata* in Europe (Keay et al. 2000; Lorenzo et al. 2010b). The facilitation theory also showed a large effect size and thus presents a new direction for research in tree invasions. Interestingly, various facilitative effects were described by the experimental studies that successfully tested this hypothesis to date. For example, establishment or regeneration of invasive tree seedlings can be facilitated by adult conspecifics and soil pathogens (Reinhart et al. 2005, 2006) and native or non-native woody species (Tecco et al. 2007; Iponga et al. 2010). In addition, the theory of facilitation can also be closely related to other processes promoting tree invasions such as disturbance (Richardson et al. 1994; Alston and Richardson 2006; Carvalho et al. 2010) or enemy release (Reinhart and Callaway 2004; Adams et al. 2009; Reinhart et al. 2010). Moreover, propagule pressure, usually seen as a key factor of plant invasion (Lockwood et al. 2009), has been quantitatively recognized as a significant characteristic of invasion in trees (Richardson 1998; Kaproth and McGraw 2008; Pysek et al. 2009; Martin and Canham 2010), and thus needs to be integrated as a basis of a null model when studying process of tree invasion (Rouget and Richardson 2003; Colautti et al. 2006). Finally, our results also emphasized the importance of both phenotypic plasticity, commonly linked to the enemy release hypothesis, and genetic adaptation, supported by the EICA hypothesis. Tested on a relative large number of invasive trees, the enemy release hypothesis has been supported in general, particularly with invasive species and populations experiencing less herbivore damage than native species of the introduced range or native populations (Lankau et al. 2004; Cincotta et al. 2009), which is consistent with previous meta-analyses on herbivore loads and invasive plant species (Maron and Vila 2001; Liu and Stiling 2006). As for the EICA hypothesis, it was also supported through genetic

evolution in invasive trees with positive and significant effect sizes detected here (Siemann and Rogers 2001; Rogers and Siemann 2004). However, because it has been soundly tested but on only a single species, *Sapium sebiferum*, more experimental studies on other tree species are needed before we can make any definitive conclusions about the role of genetic evolution of tree populations in their invasive success. In addition, in order to fully interpret the global effects of the EICA hypothesis, invasive and native populations need to be tested in more than one environment concurrently and in both native and invasive ranges (Williams et al. 2008), which has not yet been conducted for invasive tree species to date.

All the five functional traits showed positive effect sizes, and consequently can be identified as determinants of tree invasiveness. This result is in accordance with a recent meta-analysis conducted by van Kleunen et al. (2010), where invasive alien species were found to have significant greater values for six performance-related traits than non-native species. In addition, the most interesting finding of our study is that growth rate, independently of the experimental treatment applied, is an important and dominant measure in tree invasions relative to survival, density, biomass and germination. Thus, growth rate appears not only to be the key functional trait linked to invasiveness for a tree species but also to be the most associated with the invasion success of tree species once established. This is in agreement with a previous study that identified the relative growth rate as the most important predictor of invasiveness in disturbed habitats for 29 pines species (Grotkopp et al. 2002) and supports the hypothesis that stem elongation is assumed to enhance fitness by improving plant competitive ability for resources (Baruch et al. 2000; Closset-Kopp et al. 2010). In contrast, previous findings on weed species in grasslands showed that invasive species are better characterized by high germination rates rather than high growth rates (Milbau et al. 2003). Hence, trees may be unique relative to weed species in grasslands with respect to the relative importance of growth rate over other performance-related traits and, in consequence, growth rate should be more frequently used in future tree invasion

studies. Maximum assimilation rate (A_{\max}) and specific leaf area (SLA) have been identified as the most significant factors affecting relative growth rate (Swanborough and Westoby 1996; Hoffmann and Poorter 2002). Given that it also represents an easy, fast and inexpensive measurement, SLA could become an efficient diagnostic tool when assessing and comparing growth performances between native and invasive tree species. For instance, some previous studies have already emphasized the benefit of higher SLA and higher net CO₂ assimilation for invasive species over native neighbours (Baruch and Goldstein 1999; Feng et al. 2007). Nonetheless, because Rejmánek and Richardson (1996) were able to explain invasiveness in *Pinus* species using only three other traits without growth (seed mass, length of juvenile period and interval between seed mast years), quantitative measures of other functional traits are also necessary. While data are more available for tree growth and biomass as evidenced in the present study, data are scarcer on dispersal and reproduction, although these factors are crucial for invasion success (Rejmánek et al. 2005; Martin and Canham 2010). Consequently, although flowering, seed production and dispersal are hard to investigate in long-lived trees, further efforts need to focus on these reproductive traits before we could consider these conclusions as definitive.

In conclusion, both invasiveness and invasibility are involved in the expansion of exotic tree species, as previously reported for invasive grass species. Our results indeed indicate that several factors can simultaneously act to explain the success of invasive trees. In addition, although a remarkably great number of tree species are reported as invasive all over the world, few studies have focused on this taxon compared to other taxa (grass and animal) and further research is needed, especially on poorly studied broad-scale invaders such as *Acacia mearnsii* and *Leucaena leucocephala* (Richardson and Rejmanek, in press).

Acknowledgments We thank D. M. Richardson and two anonymous referees for their valuable comments that improved the manuscript. This study was supported by a grant of Canada Foundation for Innovation to CJL and a French grant of Conseils généraux de Gironde et du Gers et des Landes entitled “Programme d’étude de l’invasion de l’érable negundo dans les ripisylves du Sud-Ouest de la France” to SD.

Appendix 1

See Table 3.

Table 3 Control and treatment data for all the studies included in the meta-analysis conducted on the invasion hypotheses

References	Hypothesis	Control	Treatment
Adams et al. (2009)	ER	Invasive sp./native range/herbivory resistance	Invasive sp./invasive range/herbivory resistance
Bellingham et al. (2005)	EN	Invasive sp./invasive range/before hurricane	Invasive sp./invasive range/after hurricane
Carvalho et al. (2010)	D	Invasive sp./invasive range/unburned field	Invasive sp./invasive range/burned field
Chaneton et al. (2004)	D	Invasive sp./invasive range/unburned field	Invasive sp./invasive range/burned field
Cincotta et al. (2009)	ER	Native sp./invasive range/herbivory resistance	Invasive sp./invasive range/herbivory resistance
Donnelly and Walters (2008)	PP	Invasive sp./invasive range/0 ppt salt saltwater	Invasive sp./invasive range/15 or 30 ppt saltwater
Donnelly et al. (2008)	NW	Native sp./invasive range/no <i>Schinus</i> fruits	Native sp./invasive range/ <i>Schinus</i> fruits
Franks et al. (2008a)	EICA	Invasive sp./native population/insecticide resistance	Invasive sp./invasive population/insecticide resistance
Green et al. (2004)	ER	Invasive sp./invasive range/seedlings uncaged	Invasive sp./invasive range/seedlings caged
Huang et al. (2010)	EICA	Invasive sp./native population/herbivory resistance	Invasive sp./invasive population/herbivory resistance
Iponga et al. (2009a)	PP	Invasive sp./invasive range/ungrazed savanna	Invasive sp./invasive range/grazed savanna
Iponga et al. (2009b)	F, ER	Invasive sp./invasive range/with herbivory	Invasive sp./invasive range/without herbivory
Iponga et al. (2010)	F	Invasive sp./invasive range/under native sp.	Invasive sp./invasive range/under non-native sp.
Kaproph and McGraw (2008)	PP	Invasive sp./invasive range/terrestrial conditions	Invasive sp./invasive range/aqueous conditions
Knapp et al. (2008)	ER	Invasive sp./invasive range/herbivore exclosure	Invasive sp./invasive range/no herbivore exclosure
Lankau et al. (2004)	ER	Invasive sp./native population/herbivory resistance	Invasive sp./invasive population/herbivory resistance
Lesica and DeLuca (2004)	NW	Native sp./invasive range/outside	Native sp./invasive range/under Tamarix canopy
Liu et al. (2007)	ER	Native sp./invasive range/predation resistance	Invasive sp./invasive range/predation resistance
Lockhart et al. (1999)	FRA	Invasive sp./invasive range/no water level	Invasive sp./invasive range/high water level
Lorenzo et al. (2008)	NW	Native sp./invasive range/no <i>Acacia</i> extracts	Native sp./invasive range/ <i>Acacia</i> extracts
Lorenzo et al. (2010a, b)	NW	Native sp./invasive range/no <i>Acacia</i> extracts	Native sp./invasive range/ <i>Acacia</i> extracts
Martin and Canham (2010)	PP	Native sp./invasive range/seed production	Invasive sp./invasive range/seed production
Martin and Marks (2006)	FRA	Invasive sp./invasive range/shade	Invasive sp./invasive range/light
Mazia et al. (2001)	D	Invasive sp./invasive range/litter intact	Invasive sp./inv. range/litter removed
Mazia et al. (2010)	D	Invasive sp./invasive range/unburning and no armadillo	Invasive sp./invasive range/burning and armadillo
McCay and McCay (2009)	PP	Invasive sp./invasive range/no perch	Invasive sp./inv. range/perch
Morgan and Overholt (2005)	NW	Native sp./invasive range/distilled water	Native sp./invasive range/ <i>Schinus</i> extracts
Morrison and Mauck (2007)	ER	Invasive sp./invasive range/seedlings caged	Invasive sp./invasive range/seedlings uncaged
Nasir et al. (2005)	NW	Native sp./invasive range/no <i>Robinia</i> extracts	Native sp./invasive range/ <i>Robinia</i> extracts
Nijjer et al. (2007)	F	Invasive sp./native population/soil treatments	Invasive sp./invasive population/soil treatments
Peperkorn et al. (2005)	FRA	Invasive sp./invasive range/no light and nutrient	Invasive sp./invasive range/light and nutrient
Reinhart and Callaway (2004)	ER	Invasive sp./native range/conspecific soil	Invasive sp./invasive range/conspecific soil
Reinhart et al. (2003)	ER	Invasive sp./native range/conspecific soil	Invasive sp./invasive range/conspecific soil
Reinhart et al. (2005)	F	Invasive sp./under native canopy	Invasive sp./under non-native canopy
Reinhart et al. (2006)	F	Invasive sp./invasive range/uninvaded patch	Invasive sp./invasive range/invaded patch
Reinhart et al. (2010)	ER	Invasive sp./native soil pathogen	Invasive sp./non-native soil pathogen
Relva et al. (2010)	F	Invasive sp./seedling caged	Invasive sp./seedling uncaged

Table 3 continued

References	Hypothesis	Control	Treatment
Rogers and Siemann (2002)	ER	Native sp./invasive range/resources and herbivory	Invasive sp./invasive range/resources and herbivory
Rogers and Siemann (2003)	ER	Invasive sp./invasive range/resources and herbivory	Invasive sp./invasive range/resources and no herbivory
Rogers and Siemann (2004)	EICA	Invasive sp./native range/resource availability	Invasive sp./invasive range/resource availability
Rogers and Siemann (2005)	EICA	Invasive sp./native range/resource and herbivory	Invasive sp./invasive range/resource and herbivory
Schumacher et al. (2008)	FRA	Invasive sp./invasive range/low resource level	Invasive sp./invasive range/high resource level
Schumacher et al. (2009)	FRA	Invasive sp./invasive range/low resource level	Invasive sp./invasive range/high resource level
Siemann and Rogers (2001)	EICA	Invasive sp./native population seeds	Invasive sp./invasive population seeds
Siemann and Rogers (2003a)	FRA	Invasive range/native sp./resource level	Invasive range/invasive sp./resource level
Siemann and Rogers (2003b)	ER	Native sp./invasive range/disease resistance	Invasive sp./invasive range/disease resistance
Siemann and Rogers (2003c)	EICA	Invasive sp./native population seedlings	Invasive sp./invasive population seedlings
Siemann and Rogers (2003d)	EICA	Invasive sp./native population/herbivory resistance	Invasive sp./invasive population/herbivory resistance
Siemann and Rogers (2006)	ER	Native sp./invasive range/herbivory resistance	Invasive sp./invasive range/herbivory resistance
Siemann and Rogers (2007)	FRA	Invasive sp./invasive range/low resource level	Invasive sp./invasive range/high resource level
Siemann et al. (2006)	EICA	Invasive sp./native population seedlings	Invasive sp./invasive population seedlings
Siemann et al. (2007)	FRA	Invasive sp./invasive range/water treatment	Invasive sp./invasive range/water treatment
Tecco et al. (2006)	F	Invasive sp./invasive range/shrub cover	Invasive sp./invasive range/no shrub cover
Tecco et al. (2007)	F	Invasive sp./invasive range/shrub cover	Invasive sp./invasive range/no shrub cover
Zou et al. (2006)	EICA	Invasive sp./native population/resource availability	Invasive sp./invasive population/resource availability
Zou et al. (2008a)	EICA	Invasive sp./native population/resource availability	Invasive sp./invasive population/resource availability
Zou et al. (2008b)	EICA	Invasive sp./native population/herbivory resistance	Invasive sp./invasive population/herbivory resistance
Zou et al. (2009)	FRA	Invasive sp./invasive range/light and N treatment	Invasive sp./invasive range/light and N treatment

Mean value, sample size and error term of both control and treatment were used to calculate Hedges' *d*

D disturbance, *EICA* evolution of increased competitive ability, *EN* empty niche, *ER* enemy release, *F* facilitation, *FRA* fluctuating resource availability, *NW* novel weapons (also called "allelopathy" hypothesis)

Appendix 2

See Table 4.

Table 4 Control and treatment data for all the studies included in the meta-analysis conducted on the functional traits

References	Trait category	Control	Treatment
Adams et al. (2009)	S	Invasive sp./native range/herbivory resistance	Invasive sp./invasive range/herbivory resistance
Bellingham et al. (2005)	DC	Native sp./invasive range/after hurricane	Invasive sp./invasive range/after hurricane
Carvalho et al. (2010)	B	Native sp./invasive range/unburned field	Invasive sp./invasive range/unburned field
Chaneton et al. (2004)	B, Ge, S	Invasive sp./invasive range/unburned field	Invasive sp./invasive range/burned field
Cincotta et al. (2009)	B, S	Native sp./invasive range/herbivory resistance	Invasive sp./invasive range/herbivory resistance
Franks et al. (2008a)	B, Gr	Invasive sp./native population/insecticide resistance	Invasive sp./invasive population/insecticide resistance
Huang et al. (2010)	B, Gr	Invasive sp./native population/herbivory resistance	Invasive sp./invasive population/herbivory resistance
Knapp et al. (2008)	Gr, S	Native sp./invasive range/herbivore exclusion	Invasive sp./invasive. range/no herbivore exclusion
Lankau et al. (2004)	B, S	Invasive sp./native population/herbivory resistance	Invasive sp./invasive population/herbivory resistance

Table 4 continued

References	Trait category	Control	Treatment
Leger et al. (2007)	B	Native sp./invasive range/soil nutrients	Invasive sp./invasive range/soil nutrients
Liu et al. (2007)	Ge, S	Native sp./invasive range/predation resistance	Invasive sp./invasive range/predation resistance
Lorenzo et al. (2010a, b)	Ge, Gr	Native sp./invasive range/no <i>Acacia</i> extracts	Native sp./invasive range/ <i>Acacia</i> extracts
Martin and Canham (2010)	DC	Native sp./invasive range/seed production	Invasive sp./invasive range/seed production
Mazia et al. (2010)	S	Invasive sp./invasive range/unburning and no armadillo	Invasive sp./invasive range/burning and armadillo
McCay and McCay (2009)	DC, S	Invasive sp./invasive range/no perch	Invasive sp./inv. range/perch
Morrison and Mauck (2007)	B, Gr, S	Native sp./invasive range/seedlings caged	Invasive sp./invasive range/seedlings uncaged
Nijjer et al. (2007)	B, Gr, S	Invasive sp./native population/soil treatments	Invasive sp./invasive population/soil treatments
Peperkorn et al. (2005)	B, Gr	Native sp./invasive range/no light and nutrient	Invasive sp./invasive range/light and nutrient
Reinhart and Callaway (2004)	B, Gr	Invasive sp./native range/conspecific soil	Invasive sp./invasive range/conspecific soil
Reinhart et al. (2003)	B	Invasive sp./native range/conspecific soil	Invasive sp./invasive range/conspecific soil
Reinhart et al. (2005)	B, Gr	Native sp./invasive range/under native canopy	Invasive sp./invasive range/under native canopy
Reinhart et al. (2010)	B, S	Invasive sp./native soil pathogen	Invasive sp./non-native soil pathogen
Relva et al. (2010)	DC, Gr	Native sp./invasive range	Invasive sp./invasive range
Reynolds and Cooper (2010)	Gr	Native sp./invasive range/light and water treatment	Invasive sp./invasive range/light and water treatment
Rogers and Siemann (2002)	Gr,	Native sp./invasive range/resources and herbivory	Invasive sp./invasive range/resources and herbivory
Rogers and Siemann (2004)	B, Gr	Invasive sp./native range/resource availability	Invasive sp./invasive range/resource availability
Rogers and Siemann (2005)	B, Gr	Invasive sp./native range/resource and herbivory	Invasive sp./invasive range/resource and herbivory
Schumacher et al. (2008)	B, Gr	Native sp./invasive range/low resource level	Invasive sp./invasive range/high resource level
Schumacher et al. (2009)	B, Gr	Native sp./invasive range/low resource level	Invasive sp./invasive range/high resource level
Siemann and Rogers (2001)	Gr	Invasive sp./native population seeds	Invasive sp./invasive population seeds
Siemann and Rogers (2003a)	B	Invasive range/native sp./resource level	Invasive range/invasive sp./resource level
Siemann and Rogers (2003b)	B, Ge, Gr, S	Native sp./invasive range/disease resistance	Invasive sp./invasive range/disease resistance
Siemann and Rogers (2003c)	Gr	Invasive sp./native population seedlings	Invasive sp./invasive population seedlings
Siemann and Rogers (2003d)	Gr, S	Invasive sp./native population/herbivory resistance	Invasive sp./invasive population/herbivory resistance
Siemann and Rogers (2006)	Ge, S	Native sp./invasive range/herbivory resistance	Invasive sp./invasive range/herbivory resistance
Siemann et al. (2006)	Gr, S	Invasive sp./native population seedlings	Invasive sp./invasive population seedlings
Tecco et al. (2006)	DC	Native sp./invasive range	Invasive sp./invasive range
Zou et al. (2006)	B, Gr, S	Invasive sp./native population/resource availability	Invasive sp./invasive population/resource availability
Zou et al. (2008a)	B, Gr, S	Invasive sp./native population/resource availability	Invasive sp./invasive population/resource availability
Zou et al. (2008b)	B, S	Invasive sp./native population/herbivory resistance	Invasive sp./invasive population/herbivory resistance
Zou et al. (2009)	B, Gr, DC	Invasive sp./native population/light and N treatment	Invasive sp./invasive population/light and N treatment

Mean value, sample size and error term of both control and treatment were used to calculate Hedges' d

B biomass, *Ge* germination, *Gr* growth rate, *DC* density/cover, *S* survival

Appendix 3

See Table 5.

Table 5 List of the invasive tree species studied in the 96 articles selected from the systematic review

Invasive tree sp	Family	Growth form	Native range		Introduced range		Climate	Invaded habitat	Study location
			Location	Climate	Location	Climate			
<i>Acacia cyclops</i>	Mimosaceae	Broadl ev	S Aus, W Aus	Temp	SA	Temp	Shrubl	SA	
<i>Acacia dealbata</i>	Mimosaceae	Broadl ev	SE Aus	Temp	S Eur	Temp	Open, for	Spa	
<i>Acacia longifolia</i>	Mimosaceae	Broadl ev	SE Aus	Temp	SA, Por	Temp	Sand, shrubl, for	Por, Ger, SA	
<i>Acacia saligna</i>	Mimosaceae	Broadl ev	SW Aus	Temp	SA	Temp	Shrubl, for	SA	
<i>Acer negundo</i>	Aceraceae	Broadl dec	N Am	Temp	Eur	Temp	Dist, rip hab	USA, Fra, CZ	
<i>Acer platanoides</i>	Aceraceae	Broadl dec	Eur	Temp	NE Am	Temp	For	USA, Eur	
<i>Adenanthera pavonia</i>	Fabaceae	Broadl dec	India, SE Asia	Trop	Ams, Pac Is	Trop	Coastl, dist, for	Aus	
<i>Ailanthus altissima</i>	Sinatrubaceae	Broadl dec	China	Temp/subtr	USA, SE Eur, Aus, NZ	Temp/subtrop	Dist, open, for	USA, CZ	
<i>Alstonia macrophylla</i>	Apocynaceae	Broadl ev	SE Asia	Trop	Ind Is, Pac Is	Trop	For	Seychelles	
<i>Bischofia javanica</i>	Euphorbiaceae	Broadl ev	SE Asia, Aus, Pac Is	Trop	Jap	Subtrop	For	Jap	
<i>Cinnamomum verum</i>	Lauraceae	Broadl ev	Asia	Trop	Ind Is, Pac Is	Trop	For	Seychelles	
<i>Elaeagnus angustifolia</i>	Elaeagnaceae	Broadl dec	E Eur, Asia	Temp/subtr	S USA	Temp/subtrop	For	USA	
<i>Eriobotrya japonica</i>	Rosaceae	Broadl ev	SE Asia	Temp	N Am, Med Bas, SA	Temp	For	SA	
<i>Eugenia uniflora</i>	Myrtaceae	Broadl ev	Bra	Trop	SE USA	Subtrop	For	USA	
<i>Gleditsia triacanthos</i>	Fabaceae	Broadl dec	E N Am	Temp	Arg, Eur, SA, Aus	Temp	Grassl, for	Arg	
<i>Homalanthus populifolius</i>	Euphorbiaceae	Broadl ev	E Aus	Temp	SA, NZ, HI	Temp	For	SA	
<i>Ligustrum lucidum</i>	Oleaceae	Broadl ev	E Asia	Temp	USA, Arg, S Af, Aus, NZ	Temp	Grassl, for	Arg	
<i>Melaleuca quinquenervia</i>	Myrtaceae	Broadl ev	E Aus, NGui, NCal	Temp/subtr	SE USA	Subtrop	Grassl, shrubl, for	USA	
<i>Paraserianthes lophantha</i>	Fabaceae	Broadl ev	SW Aus	Temp	S Am, S Af, NZ, HI	Temp	For	SA	
<i>Paulownia tomentosa</i>	Scrophulariaceae	Broadl dec	Asia	Temp	USA	Temp	For	USA	
<i>Pinus canariensis</i>	Pinaceae	Conifer	Canary Is	Temp	W USA, SA, Aus	Temp	shrubl, for	SA	
<i>Pinus halepensis</i>	Pinaceae	Conifer	Med Bas	Temp	S Am, S Af, Aus, NZ	Temp	Grassl, shrubl, for	Arg, SA	
<i>Pinus pinaster</i>	Pinaceae	Conifer	W Eur, N Af	Temp	SA	Temp	Shrubl, for	SA	
<i>Pinus ponderosa</i>	Pinaceae	Conifer	W NA	Temp	S Am, SA, Aus, NZ	Temp	Grassl, shrubl, for	Arg	
<i>Pinus radiata</i>	Pinaceae	Conifer	W NA	Temp	S Am, SA, Aus, NZ	Temp	Grassl, shrubl	Arg, SA	
<i>Pinus strobus</i>	Pinaceae	Conifer	NA	Temp	Eur, SA	Temp	Grassl, shrubl, for	CZ, SA	
<i>Pittosporum undulatum</i>	Pittosporaceae	Broadl ev	SE Aus	Subtr	Car Is, S Bra, Az Is, SA	Temp/subtrop	For	Jam, SA	
<i>Populus x canescens</i>	Salicaceae	Broadl dec	Eur	Temp	N Am, SH	Temp	For	SA	
<i>Prosopis caldenia</i>	Fabaceae	broadl ev	S Am	Temp	Arg	Temp	Grassl, for	Arg	

Table 5 continued

Invasive tree sp	Family	Growth form	Native range		Introduced range		Invasion habitat	Study location
			Location	Climate	Location	Climate		
<i>Prunus serotina</i>	Rosaceae	Broadl dec	N Am	Temp	Eur	Temp	Grassl, for	USA, Fra, Bel, Hol, CZ, Pol, Arg
<i>Pseudoisuga menziesii</i>	Pinaceae	Conifer	W N Am	Temp	W Eur, SA	Temp	For	Arg
<i>Psidium cattleianum</i>	Myrtaceae	Broadl ev	S Am	Trop	Ind Is, Pac Is	Trop	For	Seychelles
<i>Quercus robur</i>	Fagaceae	Broadl dec	Eur, N Af, W Asia	Temp	N Am, SA	Temp	For	SA
<i>Quercus rubra</i>	Fagaceae	Broadl dec	E N Am	Temp	Eur	Temp	For	CZ
<i>Rhamnus cathartica</i>	Rhamnaceae	Broadl dec	Eur, W Asia	Temp	N Am	Temp	Open, for	USA
<i>Robinia pseudo-acacia</i>	Fabaceae	Broadl dec	SE USA	Temp	Eur, S Af, Asia	Temp	Dist, for	USA, CZ, Jap
<i>Sandoricum koetjape</i>	Meliaceae	Broadl ev	SE Asia	Trop	Ind Is, Pac Is	Trop	For	Seychelles
<i>Sapium sebiferum</i>	Euphorbiaceae	Broadl dec	E China	Temp/subtr	SE USA	Temp/subtrop	Grassl, coast pr	USA, China
<i>Schinus molle</i>	Anarcadiaceae	Broadl ev	S Am	Arid	S USA, SA, Aus	Arid	Grassl, for	SA
<i>Schinus terebinthifolius</i>	Anarcadiaceae	Broadl ev	S Am	Subtr/trop	S USA, S Af, Ind Is, Pac Is	Subtrop	Grassl, for	USA
<i>Solanum mauritianum</i>	Solanaceae	Broadl ev	S Am	Temp/trop	S Af, Ind Is, Aus, NZ, Pac Is	Temp/trop	For	SA
<i>Syzygium jambos</i>	Myrtaceae	Broadl ev	SE Asia	Trop	C Am, Ind Is, Aus, Pac Is	Trop	For	Seychelles
<i>Tabebuia pallida</i>	Bigoniaceae	Broadl ev	Lesser Antilles	Trop	Ind Is	Trop	For	Seychelles
<i>Tamarix ramosissima</i>	Tamaricaceae	Broadl dec	E Eur, Asia	Temp	USA, Arg, SA, Aus	Temp	For	USA
<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	Ulmaceae	Broadl dec	E Si, N China, Kor	Temp	USA, Mex, Arg	Temp	Grassl, for	Arg

For each tree species, were respectively reported their family and growth form, the location and climate of its native and introduced ranges, its invasion habitat and the study location. All the tree species listed here are reported as invasive species in the location of the corresponding article

Abbreviations are as follow: **Growth form** broadl broadleaved, dec deciduous, ev evergreen. **Climate** temp temperate, trop tropical, subtr subtropical. **Location** Af Africa, Am America, Ans Americas, Arg Argentina, Aus Australia, Az Azores, Bel Belgium, Bra Brazil, C Central, Car Caribbean, CZ Czech Republic, E East, Eur Europe, Fra France, Ger Germany, HI Hawaii, Hol Holland, Is Islands, Ind Indian Ocean, Jam Jamaica, Jap Japan, Kor Korea, Med Bas Mediterranean Basin, Mex Mexico, N North, NGal New Guinea, NCal New Caledonia, Pac Pacific, Pol Poland, Por Portugal, S South, SA Republic of South Africa, SH South Hemisphere, Si Siberia, Spa Spain, USA United States of America, NZ New Zealand, W West. **Invasion habitat** coast pr coastal prairies, dist disturbed areas, for forest, grassl grasslands, open open fields, rip hab riparian habitats, sand sand dunes, shrub shrublands

References

- Adams DC, Gurevitch J, Rosenberg MS (1997) Resampling tests for meta-analysis of ecological data. *Ecology* 78:1277–1283
- Adams JM, Fang W, Callaway RM, Cipollini D, Newell E (2009) A cross-continental test of the enemy release hypothesis: leaf herbivory on *Acer platanoides* (L.) is three times lower in North America than in its native Europe. *Biol Invasions* 11:1005–1016
- Aguilar R, Ashworth L, Galetto L, Aizen MA (2006) Plant reproductive susceptibility to habitat fragmentation: review and synthesis through a meta-analysis. *Ecol Lett* 9:968–980
- Alston KP, Richardson DM (2006) The roles of habitat features, disturbance, and distance from putative source populations in structuring alien plant invasions at the urban/wildland interface on the Cape Peninsula, South Africa. *Biol Conserv* 132:183–198
- Barton AM, Brewster LB, Cox AN, Prentiss NK (2004) Non-indigenous woody invasive plants in a rural New England town. *Biol Invasions* 6:205–211
- Baruch Z, Goldstein G (1999) Leaf construction cost, nutrient concentration, and net CO₂ assimilation of native and invasive species in Hawaii. *Oecologia* 121:183–192
- Baruch Z, Pattison RR, Goldstein G (2000) Responses to light and water availability of four invasive Melastomataceae in the Hawaiian islands. *Int J Plant Sci* 161:107–118
- Battaglia LL, Denslow JS, Inczauskis JR, Baer SG (2009) Effects of native vegetation on invasion success of Chinese tallow in a floating marsh ecosystem. *J Ecol* 97:239–246
- Bellingham PJ, Tanner EVJ, Healey JR (2005) Hurricane disturbance accelerates invasion by the alien tree *Pittosporum undulatum* in Jamaican montane rain forests. *J Veg Sci* 16:675–684
- Belote RT, Jones RH (2009) Tree leaf litter composition and nonnative earthworms influence plant invasion in experimental forest floor mesocosms. *Biol Invasions* 11:1045–1052
- Belote RT, Jones RH, Hood SM, Wender BW (2008) Diversity-invasibility across an experimental disturbance gradient in Appalachian forests. *Ecology* 89:183–192
- Blackburn TM, Jeschke JM (2009) Invasion success and threat status: two sides of a different coin? *Ecography* 32:83–88
- Blossey B, Notzold R (1995) Evolution of increased competitive ability in invasive nonindigenous plants—a hypothesis. *J Ecol* 83:887–889
- Blumenthal D (2005) Ecology—interrelated causes of plant invasion. *Science* 310:243–244
- Blumenthal DM (2006) Interactions between resource availability and enemy release in plant invasion. *Ecol Lett* 9:887–895
- Blumenthal D, Mitchell CE, Pysek P, Jarosik V (2009) Synergy between pathogen release and resource availability in plant invasion. *Proc Natl Acad Sci* 106:7899–7904
- Bruno JF, Stachowicz JJ, Bertness MD (2003) Inclusion of facilitation into ecological theory. *Trends Ecol Evol* 18:119–125
- Callaway RM, Aschehoug ET (2000) Invasive plants versus their new and old neighbors: a mechanism for exotic invasion. *Science* 290:521–523
- Callaway RM, Maron JL (2006) What have exotic plant invasions taught us over the past 20 years? *Trends Ecol Evol* 21:369–374
- Carvalho LM, Antunes PM, Martins-Loucao MA, Klironomos JN (2010) Disturbance influences the outcome of plant-soil biota interactions in the invasive *Acacia longifolia* and in native species. *Oikos* 119:1172–1180
- Chabrierie O, Verheyen K, Saguez R, Decocq G (2008) Disentangling relationships between habitat conditions, disturbance history, plant diversity and American black cherry (*Prunus serotina* Ehrh.) invasion in a European temperate forest. *Divers Distrib* 14:204–212
- Chaneton EJ, Mazia CN, Machera M, Uchitel A, Ghersa CM (2004) Establishment of honey locust (*Gleditsia triacanthos*) in burned Pampean grasslands. *Weed Technol* 18:1325–1329
- Cincotta CL, Adams JM, Holzapfel C (2009) Testing the enemy release hypothesis: a comparison of foliar insect herbivory of the exotic Norway maple (*Acer platanoides* L.) and the native sugar maple (*A. saccharum* L.). *Biol Invasions* 11:379–388
- Closset-Kopp D, Saguez R, Decocq G (2010) Differential growth patterns and fitness may explain contrasted performances of the invasive *Prunus serotina* in its exotic range. *Biol Invasions*. doi:10.1007/s10530-010-9893-6
- Colautti RI, Grigorovich IA, MacIsaac HJ (2006) Propagule pressure: a null model for biological invasions. *Biol Invasions* 8:1023–1037
- Conway WC, Smith LM, Bergan JF (2002) Potential allelopathic interference by the exotic Chinese tallow tree (*Sapium sebiferum*). *Am Midl Nat* 148:43–53
- Crooks JA (2002) Characterizing ecosystem-level consequences of biological invasions: the role of ecosystem engineers. *Oikos* 97:153–166
- Davis MA, Grime JP, Thompson K (2000) Fluctuating resources in plant communities: a general theory of invasibility. *J Ecol* 88:528–534
- Dezzotti A, Sbrancia R, Mortoro A, Monte C (2009) Biological invasion of *Pinus ponderosa* and *Pinus contorta*: case study of a forest plantation in Northwestern Patagonia. *Invest Agrar-Sist Rec F* 18:181–191
- Donnelly MJ, Walters LJ (2008) Water and boating activity as dispersal vectors for *Schinus terebinthifolius* (Brazilian pepper) seeds in freshwater and estuarine habitats. *Estuar Coast* 31:960–968
- Donnelly MJ, Green DM, Walters LJ (2008) Allelopathic effects of fruits of the Brazilian pepper *Schinus terebinthifolius* on growth, leaf production and biomass of seedlings of the red mangrove *Rhizophora mangle* and the black mangrove *Avicennia germinans*. *J Exp Mar Biol Ecol* 357:149–156
- Erfmeier A, Bruelheide H (2010) Invasibility or invasiveness? Effects of habitat, genotype, and their interaction on invasive *Rhododendron ponticum* populations. *Biol Invasions* 12:657–676
- Feng Y, Wang J, Sang W (2007) Biomass allocation, morphology and photosynthesis of invasive and non-invasive exotic species grown at four irradiance levels. *Acta Oecol* 31:40–47
- Franks SJ, Pratt PD, Dray FA, Simms EL (2008a) No evolution of increased competitive ability or decreased allocation to

- defense in *Melaleuca quinquenervia* since release from natural enemies. *Biol Invasions* 10:455–466
- Franks SJ, Pratt PD, Dray FA, Simms EL (2008b) Selection on herbivory resistance and growth rate in an invasive plant. *Am Nat* 171:678–691
- Gaertner M, Den Breeyen A, Hui C, Richardson DM (2009) Impacts of alien plant invasions on species richness in Mediterranean-type ecosystems: a meta-analysis. *Prog Phys Geogr* 33:319–338
- Gates S (2002) Review of methodology of quantitative reviews using meta-analysis in ecology. *J Anim Ecol* 71:547–557
- Green PT, Lake PS, O’Dowd DJ (2004) Resistance of island rainforest to invasion by alien plants: influence of microhabitat and herbivory on seedling performance. *Biol Invasions* 6:1–9
- Grotkopp E, Rejmánek M, Rost TL (2002) Toward a causal explanation of plant invasiveness: seedling growth and life-history strategies of 29 pine (*Pinus*) species. *Am Nat* 159:396–419
- Gurevitch J, Curtis PS, Jones MH (2001) Meta-analysis in ecology. *Adv Ecol Res* 32:199–247
- Gurevitch J, Howard TG, Ashton IW, Leger EA, Howe KM, Woo E, Lerdau M (2008) Effects of experimental manipulation of light and nutrients on establishment of seedlings of native and invasive woody species in Long Island, NY forests. *Biol Invasions* 10:821–831
- Hedges LV, Olkin I (1985) *Statistical methods for meta-analysis*. Academic Press, San Diego, CA
- Heimpel GE, Frelich LE, Landis DA, Hopper KR, Hoelmer KA, Sezen Z, Asplen MK, Wu KM (2010) European buckthorn and Asian soybean aphid as components of an extensive invasional meltdown in North America. *Biol Invasions* 12:2913–2931
- Hierro JL, Maron JL, Callaway RM (2005) A biogeographical approach to plant invasions: the importance of studying exotics in their introduced and native range. *J Ecol* 93:5–15
- Higgins SI, Richardson DM (1998) Pine invasions in the southern hemisphere: modelling interactions between organism, environment and disturbance. *Plant Ecol* 135:79–93
- Higgins SI, Richardson DM, Cowling RM (1996) Modeling invasive plant spread: the role of plant-environment interactions and model structure. *Ecology* 77:2043–2054
- Hoffmann WA, Poorter H (2002) Avoiding bias in calculations of relative growth rate. *Ann Bot-Lond* 90:37–42
- Howard TG, Gurevitch J, Hyatt L, Carreiro M, Lerdau M (2004) Forest invasibility in communities in southeastern New York. *Biol Invasions* 6:393–410
- Huang W, Siemann E, Wheeler GS, Zou JW, Carrillo J, Ding JQ (2010) Resource allocation to defence and growth are driven by different responses to generalist and specialist herbivory in an invasive plant. *J Ecol* 98:1157–1167
- Inderjit (2005) Plant invasions: habitat invasibility and dominance of invasive plant species. *Plant Soil* 277:1–5
- Iponga DM, Milton SJ, Richardson DM (2009a) Reproductive potential and seedling establishment of the invasive alien tree *Schinus molle* (Anacardiaceae) in South Africa. *Austral Ecol* 34:678–687
- Iponga DM, Milton SJ, Richardson DM (2009b) Soil type, microsite, and herbivory influence growth and survival of *Schinus molle* (Peruvian pepper tree) invading semi-arid African savanna. *Biol Invasions* 11:159–169
- Iponga DM, Milton SJ, Richardson DM (2010) Performance of seedlings of the invasive alien tree *Schinus molle* L. under indigenous and alien host trees in semi-arid savanna. *Afr J Ecol* 48:155–158
- Jackson RB, Banner JL, Jobbagy EG, Pockman WT, Wall DH (2002) Ecosystem carbon loss with woody plant invasion of grasslands. *Nature* 418:623–626
- Jones RB (1998) TechDig. Version 2.0d. Mundelein, IL
- Kaproth MA, McGraw JB (2008) Seed viability and dispersal of the wind-dispersed invasive *Ailanthus altissima* in aqueous environments. *Forest Sci* 54:490–496
- Keane RM, Crawley MJ (2002) Exotic plant invasions and the enemy release hypothesis. *Trends Ecol Evol* 17:164–170
- Keay J, Rogers WE, Lankau R, Siemann E (2000) The role of allelopathy in the invasion of the Chinese tallow tree (*Sapium sebiferum*). *Tex J Sci* 52:57–64
- Knapp LB, Fownes JH, Harrington RA (2008) Variable effects of large mammal herbivory on three non-native versus three native woody plants. *Forest Ecol Manag* 255:92–98
- Knight KS, Reich PB (2005) Opposite relationships between invasibility and native species richness at patch versus landscape scales. *Oikos* 109:81–88
- Knight KS, Oleksyn J, Jagodzinski AM, Reich PB, Kasprovicz M (2008) Overstorey tree species regulate colonization by native and exotic plants: a source of positive relationships between understorey diversity and invasibility. *Divers Distrib* 14:666–675
- Krivanek M, Pysek P (2006) Predicting invasions by woody species in a temperate zone: a test of three risk assessment schemes in the Czech Republic (Central Europe). *Divers Distrib* 12:319–327
- Krivanek M, Pysek P, Jarosik V (2006) Planting history and propagule pressure as predictors of invasion by woody species in a temperate region. *Conserv Biol* 20:1487–1498
- Kuppinger DM, Jenkins MA, White PS (2010) Predicting the post-fire establishment and persistence of an invasive tree species across a complex landscape. *Biol Invasions* 12:3473–3484
- Lankau RA, Rogers WE, Siemann E (2004) Constraints on the utilisation of the invasive Chinese tallow tree *Sapium sebiferum* by generalist native herbivores in coastal prairies. *Ecol Entomol* 29:66–75
- Leger EA, Howe KM, Gurevitch J, Woo E, Hickman J, Ashton IW, Lerdau M (2007) The interaction between soil nutrients and leaf loss during early 14 establishment in plant invasion. *Forest Sci* 53:701–709
- Leimu R, Mutikainen P, Koricheva J, Fisher M (2006) How general are positive relationships between plant population size, fitness and genetic variation? *J Ecol* 94:942–952
- Lesica P, DeLuca TH (2004) Is tamarisk allelopathic? *Plant Soil* 267:357–365
- Levine JM, D’Antonio CM (1999) Elton revisited: a review of evidence linking diversity and invasibility. *Oikos* 87:15–26
- Liu H, Stiling P (2006) Testing the enemy release hypothesis: a review and meta-analysis. *Biol Invasions* 8:1535–1545
- Liu H, Stiling P, Pemberton RW (2007) Does enemy release matter for invasive plants? Evidence from a comparison of insect herbivore damage among invasive, non-invasive and native congeners. *Biol Invasions* 9:773–781

- Lockhart C, Austin DF, Aumen NG (1999) Water level effects on growth of *Melaleuca* seedlings from Lake Okeechobee (Florida, USA) littoral zone. *Environ Manag* 23:507–518
- Lockwood JL, Cassey P, Blackburn TM (2009) The more you introduce the more you get: the role of colonization pressure and propagule pressure in invasion ecology. *Divers Distrib* 15:904–910
- Lonsdale WM (1999) Global patterns of plant invasions and the concept of invasibility. *Ecology* 80:1522–1536
- Lorenzo P, Pazos-Malvido E, Gonzalez L, Reigosa MJ (2008) Allelopathic interference of invasive *Acacia dealbata*: physiological effects. *Allelopath J* 22:453–462
- Lorenzo P, Pazos-Malvido E, Reigosa MJ, Gonzalez L (2010a) Differential responses to allelopathic compounds released by the invasive *Acacia dealbata* link (Mimosaceae) indicate stimulation of its own seed. *Aust J Bot* 58:546–553
- Lorenzo P, Rodríguez-Echeverría S, Gonzalez L, Freitas H (2010b) Effect of invasive *Acacia dealbata* link on soil microorganisms as determined by PCR-DGGE. *Appl Soil Ecol* 44:245–251
- Mack RN (1996) Predicting the identity and fate of plant invaders: emergent and emerging approaches. *Biol Conserv* 78:107–121
- Mack RN, Simberloff D, Lonsdale WM, Evans H, Clout M, Bazzaz FA (2000) Biotic invasions: causes, epidemiology, global consequences, and control. *Ecol Appl* 10:689–710
- Maron JL, Vila M (2001) When do herbivores affect plant invasion? Evidence for the natural enemies and biotic resistance hypotheses. *Oikos* 95:361–373
- Martin PH, Canham CD (2010) Dispersal and recruitment limitation in native versus exotic tree species: life-history strategies and Janzen-Connell effects. *Oikos* 119:807–824
- Martin PH, Marks PL (2006) Intact forests provide only weak resistance to a shade-tolerant invasive Norway maple (*Acer platanoides* L.). *J Ecol* 94:1070–1079
- Mazia CN, Chaneton EJ, Ghersa CM, Leon RJC (2001) Limits to tree species invasion in pampean grassland and forest plant communities. *Oecologia* 128:594–602
- Mazia C, Chaneton EJ, Machera M, Uchitel A, Feler MV, Ghersa CM (2010) Antagonistic effects of large- and small-scale disturbances on exotic tree invasion in a native tussock grassland relict. *Biol Invasions* 12:3109–3122
- McCay TS, McCay DH (2009) Processes regulating the invasion of European buckthorn (*Rhamnus cathartica*) in three habitats of the northeastern United States. *Biol Invasions* 11:1835–1844
- Milbau A, Nijs I, Van Peer L, Reheul D, De Cauwer B (2003) Disentangling invasiveness and invasibility during invasion in synthesized grassland communities. *New Phytol* 159:657–667
- Milton SJ, Wilson JR, Richardson DM, Seymour CL, Dean WRJ, Iponga DM, Proches S (2007) Invasive alien plants infiltrate bird-mediated shrub nucleation processes in arid savanna. *J Ecol* 95:648–661
- Morgan EC, Overholt WA (2005) Potential allelopathic effects of Brazilian pepper (*Schinus terebinthifolius* Raddi, Anacardiaceae) aqueous extract on germination and growth of selected Florida native plants. *J Torrey Bot Soc* 132:11–15
- Morrison JA, Mauck K (2007) Experimental field comparison of native and non-native maple seedlings: natural enemies, ecophysiology, growth and survival. *J Ecol* 95:1036–1049
- Nasir H, Iqbal Z, Hiradate S, Fujii Y (2005) Allelopathic potential of *Robinia pseudo-acacia* L. *J Chem Ecol* 31:2179–2192
- Nijjer S, Rogers WE, Siemann E (2007) Negative plant-soil feedbacks may limit persistence of an invasive tree due to rapid accumulation of soil pathogens. *Proc R Soc B-Biol Sci* 274:2621–2627
- Nunez MA, Relva MA, Simberloff D (2008) Enemy release or invasional meltdown? Deer preference for exotic and native trees on Isla Victoria, Argentina. *Austral Ecol* 33:317–323
- Ohlemüller R, Walker S, Wilson JB (2006) Local vs regional factors as determinants of the invasibility of indigenous forest fragments by alien plant species. *Oikos* 112:493–501
- Peperkorn R, Werner C, Beyschlag W (2005) Phenotypic plasticity of an invasive acacia versus two native Mediterranean species. *Funct Plant Biol* 32:933–944
- Pysek P, Richardson DM (2007) Traits associated with invasiveness in alien plants: where do we stand? In: Nentwig W (ed) *Biological invasions*. Springer, Berlin, pp 97–125
- Pysek P, Richardson DM, Rejmanek M, Webster GL, Williamson M, Kirschner J (2004) Alien plants in checklists and floras: towards better communication between taxonomists and ecologists. *Taxon* 53:131–143
- Pysek P, Richardson DM, Pergl J, Jarosik V, Sixtova Z, Weber E (2008) Geographical and taxonomic biases in invasion ecology. *Trends Ecol Evol* 23:237–244
- Pysek P, Krivanek M, Jarosik V (2009) Planting intensity, residence time, and species traits determine invasion success of alien woody species. *Ecology* 90:2734–2744
- Randall JM (1993) Exotic weeds in North American and Hawaiian natural areas: the nature conservancy's plan of attack. In: McKnight B (ed) *Biological pollution: the control and impact of invasive exotic species*. Indiana Academy of Sciences, Indianapolis, pp. 159–172
- Randall JM (1996) Weed control for the preservation of biological diversity. *Weed Technol* 10:370–383
- Reich PB, Peterson DW, Wedin DA, Wrage K (2001) Fire and vegetation effects on productivity and nitrogen cycling across a forest-grassland continuum. *Ecology* 82:1703–1719
- Reinhart KO, Callaway RM (2004) Soil biota facilitate exotic *Acer* invasions in Europe and North America. *Ecol Appl* 14:1737–1745
- Reinhart KO, Packer A, Van der Putten WH, Clay K (2003) Plant-soil biota interactions and spatial distribution of black cherry in its native and invasive ranges. *Ecol Lett* 6:1046–1050
- Reinhart KO, Greene E, Callaway RM (2005) Effects of *Acer platanoides* invasion on understory plant communities and tree regeneration in the northern Rocky Mountains. *Ecography* 28:573–582
- Reinhart KO, Maestre FT, Callaway RM (2006) Facilitation and inhibition of seedlings of an invasive tree (*Acer platanoides*) by different tree species in a mountain ecosystem. *Biol Invasions* 8:231–240
- Reinhart KO, Tytgat T, Van der Putten WH, Clay K (2010) Virulence of soil-borne pathogens and invasion by *Prunus serotina*. *New Phytol* 186:484–495

- Rejmánek M (1996) A theory of seed plant invasiveness: the first sketch. *Biol Conserv* 78:171–181
- Rejmánek M, Richardson DM (1996) What attributes make some plant species more invasive? *Ecology* 77:1655–1661
- Rejmánek M, Richardson DM, Pysek P (2005) Plant invasions and invasibility of plant communities. In: van der Maarel E (ed) *Vegetation ecology*. Blackwell, Oxford, pp 332–355
- Relva MA, Nunez MA, Simberloff D (2010) Introduced deer reduce native plant cover and facilitate invasion of non-native tree species: evidence for invasional meltdown. *Biol Invasions* 12:303–311
- Reynolds LV, Cooper DJ (2010) Environmental tolerance of an invasive riparian tree and its potential for continued spread in the southwestern US. *J Veg Sci* 21:733–743
- Richardson DM (1998) Forestry trees as invasive aliens. *Conserv Biol* 12:18–26
- Richardson DM (2006) *Pinus*: a model group for unlocking the secrets of alien plant invasions? *Preslia* 78:375–388
- Richardson DM, Bond WJ (1991) Determinants of plant-distribution—evidence from pine invasions. *Am Nat* 137:639–668
- Richardson DM, Higgins SI (1998) Pines as invaders in the Southern Hemisphere. In: Richardson DM (ed) *Ecology and biogeography of Pinus*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp 450–473
- Richardson DM, Pysek P (2006) Plant invasions: merging the concepts of species invasiveness and community invasibility. *Prog Phys Geogr* 30:409–431
- Richardson DM, van Wilgen BW (2004) Invasive alien plants in South Africa: how well do we understand the ecological impacts? *S Afr J Sci* 100:45–52
- Richardson DM, Williams PA, Hobbs RJ (1994) Pine invasions in the Southern-Hemisphere—determinants of spread and invasibility. *J Biogeogr* 21:511–527
- Richardson DM, Pysek P, Rejmanek M, Barbour MG, Panetta FD, West CJ (2000) Naturalization and invasion of alien plants: concepts and definitions. *Divers Distrib* 6:93–107
- Richardson DM, Pysek P, Carlton JT (2011) A compendium of essential essential concepts and terminology in invasion ecology. In: Richardson DM (ed) *Fifty years of invasion ecology. The legacy of Charles Elton*. Wiley-Blackwell, Oxford, pp 409–420
- Richardson DM, Rejmanek M. Trees and shrubs as invasive alien species—a global review. *Divers Distrib* (in press)
- Rogers WE, Siemann E (2002) Effects of simulated herbivory and resource availability on native and invasive exotic tree seedlings. *Basic Appl Ecol* 3:297–307
- Rogers WE, Siemann E (2003) Effects of simulated herbivory and resources on Chinese tallow tree (*Sapium sebiferum*, Euphorbiaceae) invasion of native coastal prairie. *Am J Bot* 90:243–249
- Rogers WE, Siemann E (2004) Invasive ecotypes tolerate herbivory more effectively than native ecotypes of the Chinese tallow tree *Sapium sebiferum*. *J Appl Ecol* 41:561–570
- Rogers WE, Siemann E (2005) Herbivory tolerance and compensatory differences in native and invasive ecotypes of Chinese tallow tree (*Sapium sebiferum*). *Plant Ecol* 181:57–68
- Rosenberg MS (2005) The file-drawer problem revisited: a general weighted method for calculating fail-safe numbers in meta-analysis. *Evolution* 59:464–468
- Rosenberg MS, Adams DC, Gurevitch J (2000) *MetaWin: statistical software for meta-analysis*. Sinauer Associates, Sunderland
- Rouget M, Richardson DM (2003) Inferring process from pattern in plant invasions: a semimechanistic model incorporating propagule pressure and environmental factors. *Am Nat* 162:713–724
- Rouget M, Richardson DM, Milton SJ, Polakow D (2001) Predicting invasion dynamics of four alien *Pinus* species in a highly fragmented semi-arid shrubland in South Africa. *Plant Ecol* 152:79–92
- Saccone P, Pages JP, Girel J, Brun JJ, Michalet R (2010) *Acer negundo* invasion along a successional gradient: early direct facilitation by native pioneers and late indirect facilitation by conspecifics. *New Phytol* 187:831–842
- Sakai AK, Allendorf FW, Holt JS, Lodge DM, Molofsky J, With KA, Baughman S, Cabin RJ, Cohen JE, Ellstrand NC, McCauley DE, O’Neil P, Parker IM, Thompson JN, Weller SG (2001) The population biology of invasive species. *Annu Rev Ecol Syst* 32:305–332
- Schumacher E, Kueffer C, Tobler M, Gmur V, Edwards PJ, Dietz H (2008) Influence of drought and shade on seedling growth of native and invasive trees in the Seychelles. *Biotropica* 40:543–549
- Schumacher E, Kueffer C, Edwards PJ, Dietz H (2009) Influence of light and nutrient conditions on seedling growth of native and invasive trees in the Seychelles. *Biol Invasions* 11:1941–1954
- Siemann E, Rogers WE (2001) Genetic differences in growth of an invasive tree species. *Ecol Lett* 4:514–518
- Siemann E, Rogers WE (2003a) Changes in light and nitrogen availability under pioneer trees may indirectly facilitate tree invasions of grasslands. *J Ecol* 91:923–931
- Siemann E, Rogers WE (2003b) Herbivory, disease, recruitment limitation, and success of alien and native tree species. *Ecology* 84:1489–1505
- Siemann E, Rogers WE (2003c) Increased competitive ability of an invasive tree may be limited by an invasive beetle. *Ecol Appl* 13:1503–1507
- Siemann E, Rogers WE (2003d) Reduced resistance of invasive varieties of the alien tree *Sapium sebiferum* to a generalist herbivore. *Oecologia* 135:451–457
- Siemann E, Rogers WE (2006) Recruitment limitation, seedling performance and persistence of exotic tree monocultures. *Biol Invasions* 8:979–991
- Siemann E, Rogers WE (2007) The role of soil resources in an exotic tree invasion in Texas coastal prairie. *J Ecol* 95:689–697
- Siemann E, Rogers WE, Dewalt SJ (2006) Rapid adaptation of insect herbivores to an invasive plant. *Proc R Soc B-Biol Sci* 273:2763–2769
- Siemann E, Rogers WE, Grace JB (2007) Effects of nutrient loading and extreme rainfall events on coastal tallgrass prairies: invasion intensity, vegetation responses, and carbon and nitrogen distribution. *Glob Change Biol* 13:2184–2192
- Simberloff D, Nunez MA, Ledgard NJ, Pauchard A, Richardson DM, Sarasola M, Van Wilgen BW, Zalba SM, Zenni RD, Bustamante R, Pena E, Ziller SR (2010) Spread and impact of introduced conifers in South America: lessons from other southern hemisphere regions. *Austral Ecol* 35:489–504

- Swanborough P, Westoby M (1996) Seedling relative growth rate and its components in relation to seed size: phylogenetically independent contrasts. *Funct Ecol* 10:176–184
- Tecco PA, Gurvich DE, Diaz S, Perez-Harguindeguy NP, Cabido M (2006) Positive interaction between invasive plants: the influence of *Pyracantha angustifolia* on the recruitment of native and exotic woody species. *Austral Ecol* 31:293–300
- Tecco PA, Diaz S, Gurvich DE, Perez-Harguindeguy N, Cabido M, Bertone GA (2007) Facilitation and interference underlying the association between the woody invaders *Pyracantha angustifolia* and *Ligustrum lucidum*. *Appl Veg Sci* 10:211–218
- van Kleunen M, Weber E, Fischer M (2010) A meta-analysis of trait differences between invasive and non-invasive plant species. *Ecol Lett* 13:235–245
- Vanhellemont M, Verheyen K, De Keersmaecker L, Vandekerckhove K, Hermy M (2009) Does *Prunus serotina* act as an aggressive invader in areas with a low propagule pressure? *Biol Invasions* 11:1451–1462
- Wardle DA (2002) *Communities and ecosystems: linking the aboveground and belowground components*. Princeton University Press, Princeton
- Williams JL, Auge H, Maron JL (2008) Different gardens, different results: native and introduced populations exhibit contrasting phenotypes across common gardens. *Oecologia* 157:239–248
- Williamson M (1996) *Biological invasions*. Chapman & Hall, London
- Williamson M (2006) Explaining and predicting the success of invading species. *Biol Invasions* 8:1561–1568
- Williamson M, Fitter A (1996) The varying success of invaders. *Ecology* 77:1661–1666
- Yamashita N, Koike N, Ishida A (2002) Leaf ontogenetic dependence of light acclimation in invasive and native subtropical trees of different successional status. *Plant Cell Environ* 25:1341–1356
- Yelenik SG, Stock WD, Richardson DM (2004) Ecosystem level impacts of invasive *Acacia saligna* in the South African fynbos. *Restor Ecol* 12:44–51
- Zalba SM, Cuevas YA, Boo RM (2008) Invasion of *Pinus halepensis* Mill. following a wildfire in an Argentine grassland nature reserve. *J Environ Manag* 88:539–546
- Zou JW, Rogers WE, DeWalt SJ, Siemann E (2006) The effect of Chinese tallow tree (*Sapium sebiferum*) ecotype on soil-plant system carbon and nitrogen processes. *Oecologia* 150:272–281
- Zou JW, Rogers WE, Siemann E (2008a) Increased competitive ability and herbivory tolerance in the invasive plant *Sapium sebiferum*. *Biol Invasions* 10:291–302
- Zou JW, Siemann E, Rogers WE, DeWalt SJ (2008b) Decreased resistance and increased tolerance to native herbivores of the invasive plant *Sapium sebiferum*. *Ecography* 31:663–671
- Zou JW, Rogers WE, Siemann E (2009) Plasticity of *Sapium sebiferum* seedling growth to light and water resources: inter- and intraspecific comparisons. *Basic Appl Ecol* 10:79–88