

1 **Title: Introduced species that overcome life history tradeoffs can cause native**
2 **extinctions**

3
4 Jane A. Catford^{a,b,c,d*}, Michael Bode^{b,e} and David Tilman^{d,f}

5 *Author affiliations:*

6 ^aBiological Sciences, University of Southampton, Southampton, SO17 1BJ, UK

7 ^bSchool of BioSciences, The University of Melbourne, Vic 3010, Australia

8 ^cFenner School of Environment and Society, The Australian National University, Canberra,
9 ACT 2601, Australia

10 ^dDepartment of Ecology, Evolution and Behavior, University of Minnesota, Saint Paul, MN
11 55108, USA

12 ^eSchool of Mathematical Sciences, Queensland University of Technology, Brisbane, QLD
13 4001, Australia

14 ^fBren School of the Environment, University of California, Santa Barbara, CA, USA

15 **Corresponding author:* Jane A. Catford, Biological Sciences, University of Southampton,
16 Highfield Campus, Southampton, SO17 1BJ, UK +44 23 8059 4729, ORCID ID:
17 orcid.org/0000-0003-0582-5960, J.A.Catford@soton.ac.uk

18

19

20 **Abstract**

21 Introduced species threaten native biodiversity, but whether exotic species can competitively
22 displace native species remains contested. Building on theory that predicts multi-species
23 coexistence based on a competition-colonisation tradeoff, we derive a mechanistic basis by
24 which human-mediated species invasions could cause extinctions through competitive
25 displacement. In contrast to past invasions, humans principally introduce modern invaders,
26 repeatedly and in large quantities, and in ways that can facilitate release from enemies and
27 competitors. Associated increases in exotic species' propagule rain, survival and competitive
28 ability could enable some introduced species to overcome the tradeoffs that constrain all
29 other species. Using evidence from metacommunity models, we show how species
30 introductions could disrupt species coexistence, generating extinction debts, especially when
31 combined with other forms of anthropogenic environmental change. Even though competing
32 species have typically coexisted following past biogeographic migrations, the multiplicity
33 and interactive impacts of today's threats could change some exotic species into agents of
34 extinction.

35 **Introduction**

36 Introduced species are documented as threatening native biodiversity^{1,2}, but whether exotic
37 species can competitively displace ecologically similar native species remains contested³⁻⁵.
38 This debate has been fueled by a dearth of identified causal mechanisms⁶, inconsistent
39 relationships observed between invasion and diversity⁷⁻⁹, and evidence from the fossil record
40 where prehistoric mass species incursions caused few, if any, extinctions through
41 competition¹⁰. In this paper, we use a theory that predicts species coexistence based on
42 interspecific tradeoffs¹¹ to derive a mechanistic basis by which human-mediated species
43 invasions could cause extinctions through competitive displacement.

44 Interspecific (or life history) tradeoffs offer a leading explanation for multi-species
45 coexistence^{11,12}: if each species (regardless of origin) occupies a unique position along the
46 same multidimensional competitive tradeoff surface, then an invading species cannot
47 competitively displace any existing species because no species can outperform others under
48 all conditions¹⁰. This “universal tradeoff hypothesis” asserts that traits of ecologically similar
49 species are bound to the same interspecific tradeoff surfaces, regardless of species’
50 biogeographic or phylogenetic origins¹⁰ (but see¹³). A key corollary of this hypothesis is that
51 invading species should stably coexist with ecologically similar native species in spatially
52 heterogeneous habitats, a prediction supported by paleontological studies examining effects
53 of past species migrations to new continents¹⁰. If universal tradeoffs exist, such that all
54 species are bound by the same rules regardless of their origin, then any conditions that allow
55 invading species to overcome such tradeoffs could result in extinctions of competing species.

56 Focusing on the well-known competition-colonisation tradeoff, whereby an increased
57 allocation towards reproduction and dispersal comes at a cost of species’ ability to compete
58 for a limiting resource¹¹, we consider two processes that are key features of modern invasions
59 – cultivation and enemy release – and use them to highlight ways that human introduction
60 could make modern invasions qualitatively distinct from those of the past. Human-influenced
61 processes, like the two we examine, could allow some modern invaders to move off the
62 competition-colonisation tradeoff surface, potentially resulting in local extinctions of native
63 species. We note, though, that most introduced species do not become dominant, displace
64 native species or experience increased abundances in their introduced ranges^{14,15}, and many
65 fail to even establish outside of areas where they are cultivated^{16,17}.

66 First, humans introduce modern invaders, usually deliberately¹⁸, and sometimes in very high
67 numbers over broad spatial and temporal scales. Pasture for livestock production is the
68 greatest land use on Earth, covering 30% of the global land surface¹⁹. Over 90% of plant taxa

69 developed and sold by agribusinesses are known to invade native ecosystems somewhere in
70 the world, and on average 30% of pasture plants are exotic and invasive in the country in
71 which they are sold²⁰. Exotic species that become invasive tend to be introduced more often
72 and over longer periods of time than exotic species that do not become invasive¹⁸. Higher
73 numbers of propagules can increase the probability of species establishment in a new
74 environment²¹ and may increase the local abundance of seed-limited species²²⁻²⁵ (though not
75 always¹⁶). In the fossil record, dispersal and migration of invaders was reliant on invaders'
76 own colonisation abilities, which were limited through tradeoffs. Today, humans plant and
77 disperse some species in high numbers, increasing the colonisation rates of some modern
78 invaders in a way that is independent of their ecophysiological traits²⁶. For example,
79 propagules of the exotic ornamental herb, *Ruellia simplex* (Mexican petunia), planted in
80 private and commercial gardens in Florida, disperse in stormwater runoff to nearby
81 floodplain forests; there they supplement the local seed supply, creating and maintaining *R.*
82 *simplex* monocultures that displace native plant species²⁷. Although the vast majority of
83 exotic species would not experience sustained, or ecologically meaningful, external
84 propagule inputs, pasture plants are often repeatedly planted across broad areas of the
85 landscape²⁰, and other exotic plants are widely used in gardens, horticulture, agriculture and
86 silviculture. As such, there is a greater (and demonstrated^{28,29}) risk that widely cultivated
87 exotic plants will invade remnant native vegetation nearby, potentially threatening native
88 species.

89 Second, humans can release some modern invaders from their enemies (and competitors) by
90 deliberately importing pest- and disease-free individuals for use in cultivation, and by rapidly
91 transporting species beyond their historical biogeographic boundaries^{30,31}. Across 473
92 European plant species recently naturalized in the US, for example, an average of 84% fewer
93 fungi and 24% fewer viruses infect each species in their introduced range than in their native

94 range, and the species with greater pathogen release were more commonly listed as noxious
 95 and invasive³². In the past, enemies were more able to move and migrate with their hosts, and
 96 the absence of human transport made the invasion process more gradual. Slower rates of
 97 invasion would have given local predators, pathogens, parasites, herbivores and competitors
 98 time to adapt to (and thus start limiting) invaders before the invaders were able to completely
 99 displace native species. Today that is not necessarily the case; *Alliaria petiolata*,
 100 *Microstegium vimineum* and *Berberis thunbergii*, three exotic plant species that are currently
 101 invasive in the US, are indirectly facilitated by a native generalist herbivore, the white-tailed
 102 deer, which preferentially grazes co-occurring native plants³³ (but see:³⁴). Not all exotic
 103 species introduced by humans experience beneficial enemy release³⁵⁻³⁸ or experience it
 104 forever^{39,40}, but those that do experience it can potentially live longer⁴¹, grow larger⁴², reach
 105 higher abundances³³, expand their environmental range^{41,43}, increase their competitive
 106 ability⁴⁴, reproduce more⁴² and reproduce more successfully⁴⁵ than in their native ranges.

107 These two processes, which stem from human cultivation and the novel evolutionary histories
 108 of exotic species, could effectively move some exotic species off a universal tradeoff surface
 109 by enabling them to become better colonisers, better competitors or longer-lived than their
 110 native counterparts (Fig. 1a, b) (Supplementary Table 1). Critically, we note that these are not
 111 the only processes that could enable species – and exotic species in particular – to move off
 112 interspecific tradeoff surfaces³¹ (Supplementary Table 2); we simply use these two
 113 prominent, and mechanistically distinct, hypotheses to illustrate our theory. Reduction of
 114 natural enemies is likely to be particularly powerful in overcoming tradeoffs since it can
 115 collectively lower mortality rates, enable plants to grow faster and larger and thus produce
 116 more seed, and increase species' competitive abilities by allowing them to live on lower
 117 levels of limiting resources³⁹. This combination of decreased mortality, higher seed
 118 production and increased competitive ability pose a triple threat of extinction, and – unlike

effects of external propagule inputs, which are local – enemy release could occur across an entire area that is invaded. The impacts of mass cultivation and enemy release on diversity may be exacerbated because today’s species introductions coincide with other forms of anthropogenic global change (Supplementary Table 2). Habitat loss, nitrogen deposition, climate change and changes in disturbance regimes can threaten native species directly, but they can also augment the benefit of high propagule rain^{25,26} and enemy release^{33,46} to exacerbate invasions (though not always²²).

In this paper, we use theoretical evidence to determine the conditions for which an exotic species could plausibly lead to local extinctions of its native competitors. We first present a model that illustrates how competition-colonisation tradeoffs allow species to coexist^{11,47}. We expand the model to incorporate ways in which modern species invasions may disrupt this mechanism of species coexistence, even when the invaders themselves are intrinsically bound by universal tradeoffs. We then analyze ensembles of metacommunity models to identify ways in which human-mediated species invasions, alone and with elevated disturbance, could plausibly drive one or more native species extinct. Our theory predicts that human-mediated species invasion – here characterized by enemy release and input of external propagules – can eventually drive ecologically similar native species locally extinct; that predicted extinctions are preceded by gradual changes in species’ relative abundances and are dependent on the characteristics of the invader relative to the native community; and that extinctions are most likely when invasion co-occurs with other forms of environmental change. Competing species have coexisted for millions of years following past biogeographic migrations¹⁰. However, the multiplicity and interactive impacts of today’s threats may cause some exotic species to become agents of extinction.

143 **Results**

144 **Model framework**

145 In the coexistence model based on a competition-colonisation tradeoff that we use, species
146 are ranked from the best to the poorest competitor (s_1 to s_N in an N -species
147 metacommunity)¹¹. Species are able to coexist if their colonisation abilities are inversely
148 related to their competitive rank (Fig. 1a). The model assumes a perfect competitive
149 hierarchy where superior competitors can displace inferior competitors, and the weakest
150 competitors only colonise vacant sites. The proportion of sites, p_i , occupied by species i over
151 time, t , is therefore determined by species i 's per-capita colonisation rate, c_i , the introduction
152 of its propagules from an external source, h_i (which can be temporary or sustained), its per-
153 capita mortality rate, m_i , and its competitive rank, i , where a species with a lower i is
154 competitively superior to all species with higher i (i.e. j is competitively superior to i ; see
155 Methods):

$$\frac{dp_i}{dt} = (c_i p_i + h_i) \left(1 - \sum_{j=1}^i p_j \right) - \left(m_i + \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} (c_j p_j + h_j) \right) p_i$$

156

157 (1)

158 **Species cultivation**

159 The colonisation rate of a “natural” species is proportional to its population size (via $c_i p_i$ in
160 Eq. 1), but species deliberately planted in gardens, silviculture, horticulture and agriculture,
161 which make up the majority of invasive plants¹⁸, can have supplies of externally-sourced
162 propagules that are independent of their local abundance (h_i in Eq. 1). Native species may

also receive external inputs of propagules if they are planted and cultivated by humans. However, modern exotic species are more likely to experience increased h_i because by definition they are introduced by humans and associated with humans.

We find that the addition of an external propagule supply (h_i) increases the relative abundance of an invader (s_{10} in Fig. 1), which can subsequently exclude or reduce the abundance of some or all of the species that are its inferior competitors (Fig. 1, Supplementary Figs 1-3), a result that is consistent across simulations of 250 different 20-species communities (Fig. 2a). The probability and extent of species displacement increases over time as the population size of the invader increases, and effects cascade through the populations of inferior competitors (Fig. 1). Generally, the further a species is shifted off the tradeoff surface through higher values of h_i and the greater the number of (ecologically similar) inferior competitors the invader has, the higher the rate and number of extinctions that eventually occur (Fig. 1, Supplementary Figs 1-2). Native species that have similar colonisation abilities as the invader (but are competitively inferior), and are thus positioned close to the invader on the (undisrupted) tradeoff surface, are most affected by additions of h_i .

Temporary (as opposed to permanent) increases in h_i cause transient reductions in species' abundances that remain visible many generations after the introduction event (Supplementary Fig. 3). Although most populations may ultimately recover, extended periods of low abundance heighten species' exposure to demographic and environmental extinction risk⁶, so even temporary increases in invader h_i may threaten native species persistence.

Enemy release

Species may experience lower rates of enemy attack, including seed predation, when introduced beyond their historic range³⁰. Rather than discussing the generality of enemy release^{48,49} (and other hypotheses that invoke the novel evolutionary histories of exotic

species, which may shift species off the tradeoff surface through changes in biotic interactions^{26,31,50}), here we focus on the potential implications of enemy release – if and when it occurs – on species coexistence.

We model the direct effects of enemy release by reducing the mortality rate (m_i) of individual invasive species, but recognize that enemy release may also increase a species' colonisation ability (c_i) and its competitive rank^{30,42,44}. As with increased h_i , decreased m_i causes the abundance of the released invader to increase to the detriment of inferior competitors, which may be driven extinct (Fig. 2b). We note that direct increases in species' competitive ability, which would accompany reductions in mortality and tissue loss (Supplementary Fig. 4)⁴⁴, could also cause competitive displacements following enemy release. Among other examples^{26,51,52} (Supplementary Table 1), observations of a doubled growth rate and greater shade tolerance, as well as 41% lower mortality, of the invasive shrub *Clidemia hirta* when released from fungal and insect enemies seem to support this prediction⁴¹. The greatest number of extinctions, of course, would come from an invader having: more propagules; decreased mortality; *and* increased competitive ability.

Environmental change

Modern biological invasions occur in the context of multiple anthropogenic environmental changes, including climate change, habitat destruction, habitat fragmentation, nutrient deposition and altered disturbance regimes (Supplementary Table 2), each of which could reduce the abundance of one or more native species. Such reduced abundances might, in combination with human-mediated invasions, cause extinction even if neither factor would do so on its own.

To gauge potential interactive effects of invasions and environmental change, we examined diversity consequences of species-specific increases in h_i when they are set against a

backdrop of elevated disturbance (increasing m_i of all species in the metacommunity), as would be experienced with increased trampling, mowing, storm damage, fire, and so on. Increasing mortality rates (m_i) of all species generally heightened the number and rate of extinctions caused by species-specific increases in h_i (Fig. 2a cf Fig. 3). By itself, elevated disturbance also led to species losses. As with the specific example of habitat destruction⁵³, elevated disturbance disproportionately reduces the abundance of poor colonisers (which are also better competitors, reflecting tradeoffs), increasing their risk of extinction. Elevated disturbance correspondingly limits the impact of competitive invaders, which are poor colonisers (s_I in Fig. 3). Species-specific increases in h_i and reductions in m_i can counteract effects of elevated disturbance, meaning invaders would be less affected by disturbance than native species, all else being equal.

Discussion

About 13,000 vascular plant species, 4% of the world's flora, are naturalized outside of their native range⁵⁴. Each of these exotic species must allocate some of its resources to disperse, establish and reproduce – just like native species. However, human intervention means that exotics may not experience the full suite of constraints experienced by native species in vicinities where they are introduced and cultivated²⁶.

Compounding the introduction and dispersal advantage of cultivated plants, laws of many countries only allow the importation of exotic plants if they are certifiably free of pests or pathogens, resulting in a joint h_i and m_i scenario. This biosecurity requirement is designed to prevent the arrival of new pests and pathogens that could devastate agriculture, horticulture and forestry industries (e.g. Dutch elm disease, *Phytophthora*). However, exotic species that had been particularly strongly restrained in their native habitat by high enemy loads may therefore be unusually successful in habitats in which they become essentially enemy-free

(Supplementary Table 1). This dynamic may partially explain why some species with highly restricted native ranges can become globally invasive. For example, Monterey pine (*Pinus radiata*) is planted in over 4 million hectares throughout the world for timber production, and is the dominant tree plantation species used in Chile, Australia and New Zealand⁵⁵. It has escaped from cultivation and invades native vegetation, and is of high conservation concern in much of the Southern hemisphere⁵⁶ where its invasiveness is partially attributed to enemy release⁵⁵. *P. radiata* has a tiny native range in California and Mexico where it naturally experiences high mortality from frequent wildfires, is the primary host of a mistletoe parasite, and suffers high disease loads^{55,57}.

Species that are rare in their native ranges but highly invasive elsewhere, like Monterey pine, Cootamundra wattle (*Acacia baileyana*), Blue gum (*Eucalyptus globulus*), Small balsam (*Impatiens parviflora*) and Yellow start thistle (*Centaurea solstitialis*), may exemplify species that have overcome an interspecific tradeoff because of human introduction.

Demographic data from 625 plant species suggest that invasive species may flout the fast growth versus long survival tradeoff that constrains other species because, unlike the vast majority of non-invasive species, they are able to achieve high reproduction and fast growth rates without compromising survival⁵¹. How these species might be overcoming this tradeoff is largely unexplored, but there is some suggestive evidence that enemy release could be responsible. The ability of *Acer platanoides*, an invasive tree in the US, to maintain high growth rates under both high and low light⁴³ has been attributed to it experiencing a three-fold reduction in herbivory in its introduced versus native range⁵⁸, and lower herbivore attack than a native congener⁵⁹. Similar observations have been made in tropical⁴¹ and temperate²⁵ forests for other exotic species (Supplementary Table 1). The notable success of some biocontrol agents in constraining deliberately introduced exotic species, like Prickly pear (*Opuntia stricta*), *Salvinia molesta* and Gorse (*Ulex europaeus*), demonstrates the importance

of confining invaders to their position on interspecific tradeoff surfaces for species
coexistence.

Our theoretical model predicts that invading species that overcome universal tradeoffs could
eventually displace co-occurring, native species that occupy similar niches as the invader. [If
using Chesson's framework⁶⁰, this can be conceived as enhancing the fitness of invaders
relative to co-occurring natives⁶¹]. Local extinctions of native species have been observed
that may stem from the disruption of interspecific tradeoffs (whether via human introduction,
enemy release or another mechanism³¹, Supplementary Table 3), but such extinctions are
generally predicted to occur tens to hundreds of generations after the onset of species
invasion¹⁰. The ability to overcome interspecific tradeoffs is not necessarily restricted to
exotic species (though exotics are much more likely to experience enemy release and other
benefits of novel evolutionary histories, in particular, than natives), and likely applies to more
than just plants. Patagonian lakes with higher aquaculture intensity have higher abundances
of exotic salmonids and lower abundances of native fish⁶², and exotic populations of animals
have half as many parasite species and experience lower infection rates per individual than
native populations⁶³. Experiments designed to directly test this theory will no doubt be very
informative.

By identifying mechanisms through which exotic species introduction and cultivation could
prompt the local extinction of native con-trophic species, our theory may help resolve a
question that has inspired vigorous debate in ecology and conservation biology³⁻⁵. The theory
predicts that invasion-induced con-trophic extinctions are local, delayed, preceded by gradual
changes in species' relative abundances, dependent on the characteristics of the invader
relative to the native species, and are most likely when invasion co-occurs with other forms
of global change. These conditions are matched by empirical observations^{2,26}. When
considering the two processes that we have focused on – cultivation and enemy release,

impacts are likely to be greatest when the invaders are highly competitive yet ecologically similar to native species (akin to large fitness but small niche differences^{60,61}), intensively cultivated or planted, and when they experience high levels of enemy release. Many species introduced to date may be poor competitors⁶⁴, and only some of these species are likely to have been moved off the tradeoff surface far enough, or for long enough, to meaningfully reduce the abundances of native species. So, while global extinctions are a possible outcome of our proposed mechanism, they have, at least for now, been relatively rare².

We appreciate that our theoretical assumptions simplify the real world, and do not suggest that all exotic species will overcome the tradeoff surface or will cause native extinctions. Rather, we illustrate a mechanism by which species invasion, and particularly the introduction of enemy-free species and mass cultivation, could cause the eventual displacement of ecologically similar native species. Given that species displacement occurs over many generations (Fig. 1, Supplementary Figs 1-2)^{6,10}, and that the majority of species introductions have occurred in the last 200 years and at rapidly increasing rates⁶⁵, it seems plausible that most invasion-induced extinctions are yet to occur.

Methods

We used ensembles of multispecies metacommunity competition models to simulate the dynamics of communities where one species does not conform to a competition-colonisation tradeoff^{11,66}.

Generating an ensemble of stable metacommunities

The metacommunity model was continuous in space, with the abundance dynamics of each population described by the proportion of the total available area they occupy (equation 1)^{11,66}. Equilibrium abundances for 20-species metacommunities were found by iteratively

solving the equations, from the most competitive to the least competitive species. To robustly assess the effect of invaders on extinction rates, we generated a large ensemble of different metacommunities, each with 20 coexisting species. Each species' colonisation rate was chosen independently from a uniform random distribution $c_i \sim U(0,5)$, and their competitive ranking was assigned as the inverse of their colonisation ranking. All species had the same mortality rate of $m = 0.05$. The input of external propagules was initially set to zero ($h_i = 0$). A search of 5×10^8 randomly generated metacommunities yielded 250 that could stably coexist, and the following analyses and conclusions are based on this entire ensemble.

Assessing effects of invaders overcoming a tradeoff surface

Using the stable 20-species metacommunities created as outlined above, we designated one of the coexisting species, a , as the “invader”, and manipulated its propagule supply (h_a) and mortality (m_a) such that it could overcome the competition-colonisation tradeoff. We used this approach, rather than adding an additional species, to ensure we were using a combination of species that would ordinarily coexist, i.e., without human intervention. We increased h_a to simulate an increase in the invader's propagule rain (which affects net colonisation). The scale of the variable h_i can be understood in relation to the proportion of available microsites (the space required for an individual plant); for example, a value of $h_i = 0.1$ implies that propagules from anthropogenic sources would be sufficient to colonise 10% of microsites in an entirely vacant plot. We reduced, m_a , the mortality of the invader, to simulate enemy release. When we simulated elevated disturbance, we increased the value of m_i for all species in the metacommunity (including the invader) by the same amount.

For each analysis, we designated a particular species to be the invader, and simulated the resulting changes in the metacommunity abundances. Fig. 1c shows the resulting changes in the relative abundance of each species through time, $p_i(t)$, for a single metacommunity.

Species extinctions were calculated as the proportion of the 19 “native” species that had been lost from the metacommunity at a given time. We defined a species as extinct at time t if its abundance declined below 0.01% of its original equilibrium abundance at any time prior to t .

Model complexity

Although the competition-colonisation trade-off model has been extended and developed^{53,67,68}, we use a simple version to ensure that our points are clear⁶⁹, but note that our modifications could be applied to all variants of the model.

In particular, we used a limited number of scenarios and a simple theoretical model that i) does not include niche preemption, ii) has uniform mortality across all species, and iii) specifies that the release of invaders from natural enemies only results in a reduction in mortality. If we had used replacement rather than displacement competition (i.e. allowing for niche preemption by waiting for individuals to die before microsites can be recolonised⁷⁰), the relative advantage of h_i would have been greater, potentially enabling poorer competitors to exclude better ones⁶⁷, especially when combined with elevated disturbance. If we had allowed mortality rates to vary among species such that mortality was part of the tradeoff enabling coexistence (i.e. a three-way tradeoff among species’ colonisation ability, competitive ability and mortality), elevated disturbance would be expected to have disproportional impact on species that usually rely on low rates of mortality as a mechanism for coexistence.

Our model used a 20-species metacommunity positioned along one tradeoff surface and assumed that there was complete overlap in spatial and temporal patterns of species’ growth (e.g. no effect of varying phenology, growth form or architecture, which are known to be important²⁴). This is a necessary simplification of naturally-occurring communities, and we acknowledge that the predictive power or applicability to a specific system can be limited

with such a simple approach⁷¹. We nevertheless contend that our key points, demonstrated here, apply to more complex systems and more diverse communities because of the role of interspecific tradeoffs in facilitating species coexistence. Species coexist via multiple tradeoffs, reflecting the myriad resources for which species can compete (e.g. light, nutrients, water)¹². The ideas we have discussed in our paper should be applicable to these tradeoffs.

Code availability

Results can be reproduced from code available on GitHub:

https://github.com/MikeBode/Introduced_Tradeoffs.

Data availability

Results can be reproduced from the models described in the paper, but these data are also available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

References

- 1 Tittensor, D. P. *et al.* A mid-term analysis of progress toward international biodiversity targets. *Science* **346**, 241-244 (2014).
- 2 Bellard, C., Cassey, P. & Blackburn, T. M. Alien species as a driver of recent extinctions. *Biology Letters* **12**, 20150623 (2016).
- 3 Simberloff, D. *et al.* Non-natives: 141 scientists object. *Nature* **475**, 36 (2011).
- 4 Hulme, P. E. *et al.* Challenging the view that invasive non-native plants are not a significant threat to the floristic diversity of Great Britain. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci.* **112**, E2988-E2989 (2015).
- 5 Thomas, C. D. The Anthropocene could raise biological diversity. *Nature* **502**, 7 (2013).

378 6 Gilbert, B. & Levine, J. M. Plant invasions and extinction debts. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci.* **110**, 1744–1749 (2013).

379

380 7 Vellend, M. *et al.* Global meta-analysis reveals no net change in local-scale plant

381 biodiversity over time. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci.* **110**, 19456–19459 (2013).

382 8 Vilà, M. *et al.* Ecological impacts of invasive alien plants: a meta-analysis of their

383 effects on species, communities and ecosystems. *Ecol. Lett.* **14**, 702–708. (2011).

384 9 Dornelas, M. *et al.* Assemblage time series reveal biodiversity change but not

385 systematic loss. *Science* **344**, 296–299 (2014).

386 10 Tilman, D. Diversification, biotic interchange, and the universal trade-off

387 hypothesis. *Am. Nat.* **178**, 355–371 (2011).

388 11 Tilman, D. Competition and biodiversity in spatially structured habitats. *Ecology*

389 **75**, 2–16 (1994).

390 12 Harpole, W. S. *et al.* Addition of multiple limiting resources reduces grassland

391 diversity. *Nature* **537**, 93–96 (2016).

392 13 Fridley, J. D. & Sax, D. F. The imbalance of nature: revisiting a Darwinian

393 framework for invasion biology. *Glob. Ecol. Biogeog.* **23**, 1157–1166 (2014).

394 14 Parker, J. D. *et al.* Do invasive species perform better in their new ranges?

395 *Ecology* **94**, 985–994 (2013).

396 15 Firn, J. *et al.* Abundance of introduced species at home predicts abundance away

397 in herbaceous communities. *Ecol. Lett.* **14**, 274–281 (2011).

398 16 Zenni, R. D. & Nuñez, M. A. The elephant in the room: the role of failed invasions

399 in understanding invasion biology. *Oikos* **122**, 801–815 (2013).

400 17 Diez, J. M. *et al.* Learning from failures: testing broad taxonomic hypotheses

401 about plant naturalization. *Ecol. Lett.* **12**, 1174–1183 (2009).

- 402 18 Dehnen-Schmutz, K., Touza, J., Perrings, C. & Williamson, M. The horticultural
403 trade and ornamental plant invasions in Britain. *Conservation Biology* **21**, 224-
404 231 (2007).
- 405 19 Steinfeld, H., Gerber, P., Wassenaar, T., Castel, V. & de Haan, C. *Livestock's long*
406 *shadow: environmental issues and options*. (Food & Agriculture Org., 2006).
- 407 20 Driscoll, D. A. *et al.* New pasture plants intensify invasive species risk. *Proc. Natl*
408 *Acad. Sci.* **111**, 16622–16627 (2014).
- 409 21 Simberloff, D. The role of propagule pressure in biological invasions. *Annu. Rev.*
410 *Ecol. Evol. Systemat.* **40**, 81-102 (2009).
- 411 22 Kempel, A., Chrobock, T., Fischer, M., Rohr, R. P. & van Kleunen, M. Determinants
412 of plant establishment success in a multispecies introduction experiment with
413 native and alien species. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci.* **110**, 12727-12732 (2013).
- 414 23 Duncan, R. P., Diez, J. M., Sullivan, J. J., Wangen, S. & Miller, A. L. Safe sites, seed
415 supply, and the recruitment function in plant populations. *Ecology* **90**, 2129-
416 2138 (2009).
- 417 24 Fargione, J. & Tilman, D. Niche differences in phenology and rooting depth
418 promote coexistence with a dominant C4 bunchgrass. *Oecologia* **143**, 598-606
419 (2005).
- 420 25 Eschtruth, A. K. & Battles, J. J. Assessing the relative importance of disturbance,
421 herbivory, diversity, and propagule pressure in exotic plant invasion. *Ecol. Mono.*
422 **79**, 265-280 (2009).
- 423 26 Catford, J. A. *et al.* The intermediate disturbance hypothesis and plant invasions:
424 Implications for species richness and management. *Perspect. Plant Ecol. Evol.*
425 *Systemat.* **14**, 231-241 (2012).

- 426 27 Smith, A. M., Reinhardt Adams, C., Wiese, C. & Wilson, S. B. Re-vegetation with
427 native species does not control the invasive *Ruellia simplex* in a floodplain forest
428 in Florida, USA. *Appl. Veg. Sci.* **19**, 20-30 (2016).
- 429 28 Essl, F., Moser, D., Dullinger, S., Mang, T. & Hulme, P. E. Selection for commercial
430 forestry determines global patterns of alien conifer invasions. *Divers. Distrib.* **16**,
431 911-921 (2010).
- 432 29 Heidinga, L. & Wilson, S. D. The impact of an invading alien grass (*Agropyron*
433 *cristatum*) on species turnover in native prairie. *Divers. Distrib.* **8**, 249-258
434 (2002).
- 435 30 Joshi, J. & Vrieling, K. The enemy release and EICA hypothesis revisited:
436 incorporating the fundamental difference between specialist and generalist
437 herbivores. *Ecol. Lett.* **8**, 704-714 (2005).
- 438 31 Catford, J. A., Jansson, R. & Nilsson, C. Reducing redundancy in invasion ecology
439 by integrating hypotheses into a single theoretical framework. *Divers. Distrib.* **15**,
440 22-40 (2009).
- 441 32 Mitchell, C. E. & Power, A. G. Release of invasive plants from fungal and viral
442 pathogens. *Nature* **421**, 585-586 (2003).
- 443 33 Eschtruth, A. K. & Battles, J. J. Acceleration of exotic plant invasion in a forested
444 ecosystem by a generalist herbivore. *Conserv. Biol.* **23**, 388-399 (2009).
- 445 34 Parker, J. D., Burkepile, D. E. & Hay, M. E. Opposing effects of native and exotic
446 herbivores on plant invasions. *Science* **311**, 1459-1461 (2006).
- 447 35 Chun, Y. J., van Kleunen, M. & Dawson, W. The role of enemy release, tolerance
448 and resistance in plant invasions: linking damage to performance. *Ecol. Lett.* **13**,
449 937-946 (2010).

- 450 36 Dawson, W., Bottini, A., Fischer, M., van Kleunen, M. & Knop, E. Little evidence for
451 release from herbivores as a driver of plant invasiveness from a multi-species
452 herbivore-removal experiment. *Oikos* **123**, 1509-1518 (2014).
- 453 37 Schultheis, E. H., Berardi, A. E. & Lau, J. A. No release for the wicked: enemy
454 release is dynamic and not associated with invasiveness. *Ecology* **96**, 2446-2457
455 (2015).
- 456 38 Felker-Quinn, E., Schweitzer, J. A. & Bailey, J. K. Meta-analysis reveals evolution in
457 invasive plant species but little support for Evolution of Increased Competitive
458 Ability (EICA). *Ecol. Evol.* **3**, 739-751 (2013).
- 459 39 Gruntman, M., Segev, U., Glauser, G. & Tielbörger, K. Evolution of plant defences
460 along an invasion chronosequence: defence is lost due to enemy release – but not
461 forever. *J. Ecol.* **105**, 255-264 (2017).
- 462 40 Dostál, P., Müllerová, J., Pyšek, P., Pergl, J. & Klinerová, T. The impact of an
463 invasive plant changes over time. *Ecol. Lett.* **16**, 1277-1284 (2013).
- 464 41 DeWalt, S. J., Denslow, J. S. & Ickes, K. Natural enemy release facilitates habitat
465 expansion of the invasive tropical shrub *Clidemia hirta*. *Ecology* **85**, 471-483
466 (2004).
- 467 42 Hawkes, Christine V. Are invaders moving targets? The generality and
468 persistence of advantages in size, reproduction, and enemy release in invasive
469 plant species with time since introduction. *Am. Nat.* **170**, 832-843 (2007).
- 470 43 Martin, P. H., Canham, C. D. & Kobe, R. K. Divergence from the growth–survival
471 trade-off and extreme high growth rates drive patterns of exotic tree invasions in
472 closed-canopy forests. *J. Ecol.* **98**, 778-789 (2010).
- 473 44 Louda, S. M., Keeler, K. H. & Holt, R. D. in *Perspectives on Plant Competition* (eds
474 J.B. Grace & D. Tilman) 413-444 (Academic Press, San Diego, 1990).

475 45 Urli, M., Brown, C. D., Narváez Perez, R., Chagnon, P.-L. & Vellend, M. Increased
476 seedling establishment via enemy release at the upper elevational range limit of
477 sugar maple. *Ecology* **97**, 3058-3069 (2016).

478 46 Blumenthal, D., Mitchell, C. E., Pyšek, P. & Jarošík, V. Synergy between pathogen
479 release and resource availability in plant invasion. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci.* **106**,
480 7899-7904 (2009).

481 47 Levins, R. Some demographic and genetic consequences of environmental
482 heterogeneity for biological control. *B. Entomol. Soc. Am.* **15**, 237-240 (1969).

483 48 Maron, J. L. & Vilà, M. When do herbivores affect plant invasion? Evidence for the
484 natural enemies and biotic resistance hypotheses. *Oikos* **95**, 361-373 (2001).

485 49 Liu, H. & Stiling, P. Testing the enemy release hypothesis: a review and meta-
486 analysis. *Biol. Invasions* **8**, 1535-1545 (2006).

487 50 Relva, M., Nuñez, M. & Simberloff, D. Introduced deer reduce native plant cover
488 and facilitate invasion of non-native tree species: evidence for invasional
489 meltdown. *Biological Invasions* **12**, 303-311 (2010).

490 51 Salguero-Gómez, R. Applications of the fast-slow continuum and reproductive
491 strategy framework of plant life histories. *New Phytol.* **213**, 1618-1624 (2017).

492 52 Molina-Montenegro, M. A., Cleland, E. E., Watts, S. M. & Broitman, B. R. Can a
493 breakdown in competition-colonization tradeoffs help explain the success of
494 exotic species in the California flora? *Oikos* **121**, 389-395 (2012).

495 53 Tilman, D., May, R. M., Lehman, C. L. & Nowak, M. A. Habitat destruction and the
496 extinction debt. *Nature* **371**, 65-66 (1994).

497 54 van Kleunen, M. *et al.* Global exchange and accumulation of non-native plants.
498 *Nature* **525**, 100-103 (2015).

499 55 Lavery, P. B. & Mead, D. J. in *Ecology and Biogeography of Pinus* (ed David M.
500 Richardson) 432-449 (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1998).

501 56 Richardson, D. M., Williams, P. A. & Hobbs, R. J. Pine invasions in the southern
502 hemisphere: determinants of spread and invadability. *J. Biogeog.* **21**, 511-527
503 (1994).

504 57 Hawksworth, F. G. & Wiens, D. *Dwarf Mistletoes: Biology, Pathology, and*
505 *Systematics*. 410 (USDA Forest Service, Washington, DC, 1996).

506 58 Adams, J., Fang, W., Callaway, R., Cipollini, D. & Newell, E. A cross-continental test
507 of the Enemy Release Hypothesis: leaf herbivory on *Acer platanoides* (L.) is three
508 times lower in North America than in its native Europe. *Biol. Invasions* **11**, 1005-
509 1016 (2009).

510 59 Cincotta, C., Adams, J. & Holzapfel, C. Testing the enemy release hypothesis: a
511 comparison of foliar insect herbivory of the exotic Norway maple (*Acer*
512 *platanoides* L.) and the native sugar maple (*A. saccharum* L.). *Biol. Invasions* **11**,
513 379-388 (2009).

514 60 Chesson, P. Mechanisms of maintenance of species diversity. *Annu. Rev. Ecol.*
515 *Evol. Systemat.* **31**, 343-366 (2000).

516 61 MacDougall, A. S., Gilbert, B. & Levine, J. M. Plant invasions and the niche. *J. Ecol.*
517 **97**, 609-615 (2009).

518 62 Arismendi, I. *et al.* Aquaculture, non-native salmonid invasions and associated
519 declines of native fishes in Northern Patagonian lakes. *Freshwater Biol.* **54**, 1135-
520 1147 (2009).

521 63 Torchin, M. E., Lafferty, K. D., Dobson, A. P., McKenzie, V. J. & Kuris, A. M.
522 Introduced species and their missing parasites. *Nature* **421**, 628-630 (2003).

- 523 64 van Kleunen, M., Weber, E. & Fischer, M. A meta-analysis of trait differences
524 between invasive and non-invasive plant species. *Ecol. Lett.* **13**, 235-245 (2010).
- 525 65 Seebens, H. *et al.* No saturation in the accumulation of alien species worldwide.
526 *Nature Comm.* **8**, 14435 (2017).
- 527 66 Levins, R. Coexistence in a variable environment. *Am. Nat.* **114**, 765-783 (1979).
- 528 67 Calcagno, V., Mouquet, N., Jarne, P. & David, P. Coexistence in a metacommunity:
529 the competition-colonization trade-off is not dead. *Ecol. Lett.* **9**, 897-907 (2006).
- 530 68 Kinzig, A. P., Levin, S. A., Dushoff, J. & Pacala, S. Limiting similarity, species
531 packing, and system stability for hierarchical competition-colonization models.
532 *Am. Nat.* **153**, 371-383 (1999).
- 533 69 Holling, C. S. in *Systems Analysis in Ecology* (ed Kenneth E.F Watt) 195-214
534 (Academic Press, 1966).
- 535 70 Yu, D. W. & Wilson, H. B. The competition-colonization trade-off is dead; long live
536 the competition-colonization trade-off. *Am. Nat.* **158**, 49-63 (2001).
- 537 71 Evans, M. R. *et al.* Do simple models lead to generality in ecology? *Trends Ecol.*
538 *Evol.* **28**, 578-583 (2013).

539

540 **Acknowledgements:** We thank Richard Duncan, Adam Clark and Kyle Naish for comments
541 that helped us improve the paper. We acknowledge funding from the Australian Research
542 Council (DE120102221 to JAC; DE130100572 to MB), the ARC Centre of Excellence for
543 Environmental Decisions (to JAC and MB), and the US National Science Foundation Long-
544 Term Ecological Research Program, including DEB-0620652 and DEB-1234162. Cedar
545 Creek Ecosystem Science Reserve and the University of Minnesota provided further support.

Author contributions: JAC conceived the idea; JAC and MB designed the modeling with input from DT; MB undertook the modeling; JAC wrote the paper with input from, and revisions by, MB and DT.

The authors have no competing financial interests.

Correspondence and requests for materials should be addressed to Jane Catford (email: j.a.catford@soton.ac.uk).

Figure Legends

Figure 1: Simulated species extinctions resulting from human-mediated species invasions. a) Competition-colonisation tradeoff surface (gray line) of 20 coexisting species (blue circles) in a metacommunity, going from the best competitor (s_1) to the worst competitor (s_{20}). Species' competitive ranks are inverse to the rank order of species' colonisation abilities (this is the tradeoff). Note that, regardless of positions on the X-axis, differences in species' competitive abilities are determined by rank only such that the competitive difference between s_1 and s_2 is the same as the competitive difference between s_{18} and s_{19} . b) Schematic drawing of disrupted tradeoff showing shifted position of designated “invader” (s_{10} , the intermediate competitor in the metacommunity, white circle indicates $h_{10} = 0$) reflecting input of external colonists following Eq. 1 (i.e., increasing h_{10} from 0 to 0.025 (yellow), 0.05 (red) and 0.1 (violet); shifted positions of s_{10} on the figure were chosen to reflect the number of observed extinctions: 3 for $h_{10} = 0.025$, 5 for $h_{10} = 0.05$, and 7 for $h_{10} = 0.1$); blue circles indicate “native” species that are superior competitors and thus unaffected by the invasion; grey circles indicate the 10 natives that could be displaced by s_{10} . c) Relative abundance (log scale) of each of the 20 species over time. Each line represents a species: the red line

indicates the invader after elevating h_{I0} to 0.05; blue lines indicate persistent native species; grey lines indicate native species driven to extinction (i.e. relative abundance drops below 0.0001 of species' original equilibrium abundance) as a consequence of increasing h_{I0} . d) A timeline of percentage of the 19 native species driven to extinction as a consequence of elevating h_{I0} to 0.025, 0.05 (same scenario shown in c) and 0.1.

Figure 2: Native species extinctions resulting from species invasion in 20-species metacommunities where the invader experiences a) an increase in external colonists (h_i), and b) a reduction in mortality (m_i). For each line in each panel, a new species has been introduced that would normally coexist with the 19 other species in the metacommunity given their natural colonisation and competitive abilities (i.e., the invader naturally falls upon the universal tradeoff surface). However, input of external colonists and reduced mortality (measured on the X-axis) of the invader allows it to overcome this tradeoff and cause extinctions. Where lines plateau, all inferior competitors have been driven to extinction. The competitive rank of the invaders is indicated by different coloured lines: s_1 = pink (superior competitor), s_7 = orange, s_{13} = light blue, s_{19} = dark blue. Lines indicate average effects across an ensemble of 250 metacommunities; shaded areas enclose 95% of the metacommunity responses.

Figure 3: Native species extinctions resulting from elevated disturbance and invasion of a species with a supply of external colonists (h_i). Disturbance increases the mortality rate of all 20 species in the metacommunity from 0.05 to a) 0.06, and b) 0.35. Other details as in Fig. 2. In all panels, species are lost from the metacommunity due to increased disturbance alone (i.e. when $h_i = 0$). Invasion of s_7 causes more extinctions than s_1 under high disturbance (shown in b) because the natural colonisation rate of s_1 (c_I) is too low to cope with elevated mortality, unless increases in h_I compensate for it.





