Hydrobiologia (2009) 635:107–112

DOI 10.1007/s10750-009-9903-9

PRIMARY RESEARCH PAPER

On the origin of Echinodorus grandiflorus (Alismataceae) in Florida (‘‘E. floridanus’’), and its estimated potential as an invasive species

Samuli Lehtonen

Received: 2 March 2009 / Revised: 8 July 2009 / Accepted: 13 July 2009 / Published online: 29 July 2009

Springer Science+Business Media B.V. 2009

Abstract A large semi-aquatic plant, Echinodorus floridanus, was described and considered as a rare Floridian endemic only 10 years ago. Recent phylo-genetic studies revealed that the new species actually belongs into a South American species, E. grandif-lorus. This species has been cultivated in Florida as an ornamental aquarium plant at least since the 1980s. This only known wild population in Florida most likely originated by escaping from cultivation, or it was intentionally planted. A maximum entropy niche model suggests a potential range expansion in the southern USA, although the suitability of this area is predicted to be relatively low for the species. Apparently low risk of invasion is also demonstrated by the non-invasive history of this only known wild population. The species may, however, threaten the local flora via hybridization with native Echinodorus species, and hence eradication of the species should be considered.

Keywords Aquatic plants Conservation

Endemic species Florida burhead

Invasive plants Rare plants

Handling editor: S. M. Thomaz

S. Lehtonen (*&*)

Department of Biology, University of Turku,

20014 Turku, Finland

e-mail: samile@utu.fi

Introduction

In 1981, a large marsh plant belonging to the genus Echinodorus (Alismataceae) was collected from Pen-sacola, Florida. This specimen was later noticed to represent a species previously unknown in the USA and a new name Echinodorus floridanus Haynes & Burkhalter (Florida burhead) was established (Haynes

* Burkhalter, [1998](#page5)). No other locations of occurrence are known to the USA, and the only existing popula-tion consisting of several hundreds of individuals is bisected by a highway (Haynes & Burkhalter, [1998](#page5); Haynes & Hellquist, [2000](#page5)). Hence, the species was considered to be a rare endemic and a status for threatened or endangered species was suggested by Haynes & Burkhalter ([1998](#page5)), and the species was mentioned to be of a conservation concern in Flora of North America (Haynes & Hellquist, [2000](#page5)).

However, this status now appears to be an artifact of erroneous taxonomy (Lehtonen, [2008](#page6)). Recent advances in Echinodorus systematics (Lehtonen, [2006](#page5); Lehtonen & Myllys, [2008](#page6)) revealed several unnatural species and subspecies level rankings in previous classifications, which resulted in a partial revision of the genus (Lehtonen, [2008](#page6)). The close affinity of Echinodorus floridanus with a South American species E. grandiflorus was already sus-pected by Haynes & Burkhalter ([1998](#page5)), and the conspecific status of the two was confirmed by morphological (Lehtonen, [2006](#page5)) and molecular evi-dence (Lehtonen & Myllys, [2008](#page6)). This ledto the

123

108 Hydrobiologia (2009) 635:107–112

formal synonymization of the name E. floridanus under E. grandiflorus (Cham. & Schltdl.) Micheli (Lehtonen, [2008](#page6)).

Echinodorus is one of the most popular orna-mental plants in aquaria (Kasselmann, [2001](#page5)) with a cultivation history dating back into the early twen-tieth century (Rataj, [1978](#page6)). After a short boom of production in South America, a large-scale produc-tion began in Southeast Asia, Europe, and USA (Lehtonen & Rodrı´guez Are´valo, [2005](#page6)). Due to the favorable climatic conditions, Florida became the center of aquatic plant nurseries in the North America (McLane, [1969](#page6)).

In the USA, numerous naturalized aquatic plant species became introduced in the nature via the aquarium pathway (Les & Mehrhoff, [1999](#page6); Kay & Hoyle, [2001](#page5); Maki & Galatowitsch, [2004](#page6); Cohen et al., [2007](#page5); Keller & Lodge, [2007](#page5)), and many are causing immense threats to the native species and ecosystem services (Les & Mehrhoff, [1999](#page6)). These species are of various geographical origins, and represent widely divergent taxonomic groups (Les

* Mehrhoff, [1999](#page6)). Since it has been recognized that the family Alismataceae is over-represented by invasive species (Daehler, [1998](#page5)) and Florida provides exceptionally suitable landscapes for various nonin-digenous aquatic plants (McLane, [1969](#page6)), it is possible that E. grandiflorus possesses a threat of becoming a nuisance in Florida.

Further risk is introgression of nonindigenous genes into native populations, commonly recognized as one of the main threats for biodiversity (Seehausen et al., [2008](#page6)). Even quite remotely related Echinod-orus species are commonly crossed in order to produce new cultivars for the ornamental use in aquaria (Kasselmann, [2001](#page5)). Two native Echinodo-rus species are present in Florida: E. cordifolius (L.) Griseb. and E. berteroi (Spreng.) Fassett (Haynes & Hellquist, [2000](#page5)). In this article, the origin of the E. grandiflorus population in Florida, its invasive potential, and possible risks of hybridization with the native species are discussed.

Materials and methods

Ecological niche modeling has become a common practice to predict species’ potential ranges and their invasive potential in nonindigenous areas (Peterson &

Vieglais, [2001](#page6)). This author used Maxent ver. 3.3.0 (Maximum entropy modeling; Phillips et al., [2006](#page6); software available at [http://www.cs.princeton.edu/](http://www.cs.princeton.edu/~schapire/maxent) [*\**schapire/maxent](http://www.cs.princeton.edu/~schapire/maxent))to predict the potential range ofE. grandiflorus in southern USA. In order to produce an ecological niche model for E. grandiflorus, the author used 46 georeferenced occurrence points from the species native range, based on the herbarium specimens collected between 1925 and 2004 and deposited at BA, BM, BR, H, K, MVFA, MVFQ, MVJB, MVM, SI, TUR, UC, and UNA [herbarium codes according to Thiers (continuously updated)]. South America was used as a background to build the model, which was then projected onto southern USA to predict the potential distribution.

The niche models were based on 19 bioclimatic variables (Table [1](#page2)) from high resolution (2.5 arc minutes) climatic surfaces (Hijmans et al., [2005](#page5); <http://www.worldclim.org>). The climatic data are based on records of the 1950–2000 period (Hijmans et al., [2005](#page5)). For evaluating model, performance data were divided into training data (75% of occurrence points) and test data for model validation (25% of occurrence points). Since the prediction may depend upon the data partitioning, this author replicated the

Table 1 Bioclimatic variables used in Maxent modelling

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| BIO1 | Annual mean temperature |
| BIO2 | Mean diurnal range [mean of monthly (max temp - |
|  | min temp)] |
| BIO3 | Isothermality (P2/P7) (9100) |
| BIO4 | Temperature seasonality (standard deviation 9 100) |
| BIO5 | Max temperature of warmest month |
| BIO6 | Min temperature of coldest month |
| BIO7 | Temperature annual range (P5–P6) |
| BIO8 | Mean temperature of wettest quarter |
| BIO9 | Mean temperature of driest quarter |
| BIO10 | Mean temperature of warmest quarter |
| BIO11 | Mean temperature of coldest quarter |
| BIO12 | Annual precipitation |
| BIO13 | Precipitation of wettest month |
| BIO14 | Precipitation of driest month |
| BIO15 | Precipitation seasonality (coefficient of variation) |
| BIO16 | Precipitation of wettest quarter |
| BIO17 | Precipitation of driest quarter |
| BIO18 | Precipitation of warmest quarter |
| BIO19 | Precipitation of coldest quarter |
|  |  |

123

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Hydrobiologia (2009) 635:107–112 | 109 |
|  |  |

modeling 10 times using repeated subsampling. Lin-ear, quadratic, and hinge functions of the predictor variables were included in the models. Convergence threshold was set to 10-5 and maximum iterations at

1. The results were outputted as logistic values, which give an estimate between 0 and 1 of proba-bility of presence.

Other environmental variables, such as topography and availability of habitats, could have been incor-porated into the model as well. Within its native range, E. grandiflorus is the most common along rivers, river deltas, and other lowland areas (pers. obs.), which also typify Florida and southern USA more broadly. Aquatic habitats possibly suitable for the species are also common in the area, as can be observed from the wide occurrence of closely related E. cordifolius and more distantly related E. berteroi in the southern states (Haynes & Hellquist, [2000](#page5); Lehtonen, [2008](#page6)). Since idea of the study is to broadly limit an area where the species potentially could sustain itself, the more detailed habitat-level infor-mation is not as relevant for this study, and conse-quently is not included in the model.

In addition to previously mentioned collections, herbarium specimens collected from Floridian aquar-ium plant nurseries were found from herbaria AAU and FLAS. These specimens were not included in the niche model, but they were used to date the cultivation history of E. grandiflorus in Florida.

Results

The oldest herbarium specimen representing a wild population of E. grandiflorus in Florida was collected in 1981 (Wilhelm 9464 USF!), and further collections from the same population have been made in 1986 (Burkhalter 10310 FSU), 1989 (Burkhalter & de Graaf 11539 FSU), 1997 (Haynes & Burkhalter 9717 UNA!), 2000 (Reese 1 UNA!), and 2002 (Junge s.n. M!). The population is located at sea level in a Taxodium-dominated swamp forest (Haynes & Burk-halter, [1998](#page5)), thus resembling the native gallery forests habitats. However, these are not the only specimens of E. grandiflorus collected from Florida. At least one other herbarium collection of the species has been made from the aquarium plant nursery: McClade s.n. 19/07/1985 (AAU!) from Broward County, with Brazil mentioned as the original source.

Ridings & Zettler ([1973](#page6)) studied Aphanomyces dis-ease in the Floridian aquarium plant nurseries and its effect on the different cultivated Echinodorus species. Their voucher collections are located in FLAS (accession numbers 109518–109524), but does not include E. grandiflorus. Hence, it appears reasonable to believe that E. grandiflorus was not yet imported into Florida at the time of the Aphanomyces invasion in the early 1970s.

Maxent modeling yielded an average test AUC (area under the curve, see Phillips et al., [2006](#page6)) of 0.959 for the replicated runs, with a standard deviation of 0.061. The prediction maps averaged over all the 10 models are presented as logistic outputs in Figs. [1](#page3) (projected into native range) and [2](#page4) (projected into southern USA). The logistic output gives an relative probability of presence (Phillips & Dudı´k, [2008](#page6)). The models did not predict Florida to be generally suitable for E. grandiflorus, but a relatively narrow coastal region from Houston to New Orleans appeared as more suitable. Three variables with the largest contribution to the Maxent




Fig. 1 Native locations of E. grandiflorus used for Maxent bioclimatic modeling, with a predicted potential range in South America. The prediction is averaged logistic output of 10 Maxent models, each using randomly selected 25% of data points in model evaluation. The color scale indicates relative probability of occurrence

123

110 Hydrobiologia (2009) 635:107–112

Fig. 2 Potential range for E. grandiflorus in southern USA. The prediction is averaged logistic output of 10 Maxent models, each using randomly selected 25% of data points in model evaluation. The only known wild population in Pensacola, Florida (marked with a dot), was not incorporated in the modeling. The color scale indicates relative probability of occurrence

Table 2 The percent contribution of the 10 most important environmental variables to the Maxent model

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Variable | Percent contribution |
|  |  |
| Mean temperature of wettest quarter | 32.8 |
| Precipitation seasonality | 9.9 |
| Precipitation of driest month | 9.9 |
| Isothermality | 8.2 |
| Precipitation of warmest quarter | 7.4 |
| Mean diurnal range | 6.4 |
| Min temperature of coldest month | 4.8 |
| Temperature seasonality | 4.2 |
| Precipitation of coldest quarter | 3.4 |
| Mean temperature of coldest quarter | 2.9 |


Values shown are averages over 10 replicate runs

model were mean temperature of the wettest quarter, precipitation seasonality, and precipitation of driest month (Table [2](#page4)). According to the jackknife test, annual mean temperature is the variable including most useful information by itself.

Discussion and conclusions

Several Echinodorus species have outlying popula-tions remote from their main distribution area. This pattern can be found for at least the following species: E. berteroi has its main distribution in North America and the Caribbean Islands, but several

isolated populations are known from Ecuador, Peru, Paraguay, and Argentina (Lehtonen, [2008](#page6)); E. hor-izontalis has its main distribution in western Amazo-nia, but isolated populations have been found in the mouth of the Orinoco and Amazon rivers, in Guyana, and one collection from central Amazonia (Rataj, [1978](#page6); Lehtonen, [2008](#page6)); E. longipetalus has its main distribution in Paraguay and southern Brazil (Lehto-nen, [2008](#page6)), with two known collections from Suri-name (Rombouts 447 U!, Oldenburger et al. 292 U!), and one from Venezuela (Delascio 15335 VEN!); E. cordifolius, with its main distribution in the USA, but collected also from South Brazil (Lehtonen, [2008](#page6)); and E. grandiflorus, with its main distribution along the Atlantic coast of South Brazil, Uruguay, and Argentina, but one population in Florida (Lehto-nen, [2008](#page6)).



Most of these outlying populations are located in uninhabited and remote areas and are therefore probably natural. Furthermore, several Echinodo-rus species are distributed in various Caribbean Islands, or have otherwise wide ranges in South America, suggesting well developed long-distance dispersal capacity. However, old cultivation history may have changed distribution of some species, such as E. horizontalis in Amazonia (see Lehtonen & Rodrı´guez Are´valo, [2005](#page6)). This is even more probable for E. grandiflorus in Florida; the species is a well-known aquarium plant (Kasselmann, [2001](#page5)). In their review of nonindigenous aquatic plants of

123

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Hydrobiologia (2009) 635:107–112 | 111 |
|  |  |

New England, Les & Mehrhoff ([1999](#page6)) found that 88% of the species had their origin in cultivation, whereas only 12% of the species had been acciden-tally introduced or dispersed by themselves. Aquatic plant growers in Florida have intentionally intro-duced exotic species in the wild to guarantee constant supply and low production costs (McLane, [1969](#page6)). Therefore, it seems most likely that E. gran-diflorus in Florida originated either by escaping from cultivation, or it was intentionally planted.

The risk of E. grandiflorus invasion in Florida seems to be low. Several lines of evidence support this view: the species distribution modeling revealed no areas with high predicted suitability in Florida. However, the coastal region of Texas, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Alabama apparently could support the species. Historical evidence suggests a low invasive potential as well; despite almost 30 years of existence in Florida, E. grandiflorus still inhabits only one relatively small patch. Nevertheless, it should be taken into consideration that some aquatic plants have not become invasive until decades after the initial introduction, and a common means of invasion in a large number of species have included intentional planting and escapes from the cultivation (Les & Mehrhoff, [1999](#page6)). Hence, even though E. grandiflorus has not been an aggressive invader in Florida, new populations may become repeatedly established via the aquarium pathway, and this would be a risk especially in the more suitable coastal regions of Texas, Louisiana, and Alabama.

Changing climate, or introduction of new genes, for example, through hybridization with native Echi-nodorus species, could trigger more rapid expansion in the future. Two Echinodorus species are native to southern USA: E. cordifolius and E. berteroi (Haynes

* Hellquist, [2000](#page5)). Both of these species are common in the area predicted to be the most suitable for E. grandiflorus in the USA (Haynes & Hellquist, [2000](#page5)). Echinodorus grandiflorus is known to produce offspring in crossings with closely related E. longi-scapus Arechav. and E. floribundus (Seub.) Seub. (Rataj, [1970](#page6)). Echinodorus cordifolius belongs to the same group of closely related species (Lehtonen & Myllys, [2008](#page6)), thus possibly allowing gene transfer between E. grandiflorus and native Echinodorus species in Florida. The risk naturally gets higher if more E. grandiflorus populations become established via aquarium pathway or range expansion.

The distribution predictions presented are based on bioclimatic variables only. The real potential distri-bution area is affected by a multitude of other factors as well, such as habitat availability, dispersal capacity, biotic interactions, and so on. These factors are much harder to model, and were not included here. It is here assumed that the presence of closely related species, obvious dispersal capacity of the genus and common outbreaks of various nonindigenous aquatic plants in southern USA are strong indicators that the landscape itself would allow the range expansion of E. grandif-lorus, but only if the species can tolerate the prevail-ing climate. So far, E. grandiflorus is present as only one small population in Florida and can be quite easily eradicated, if considered appropriate.

Acknowledgments The author thanks the directors, curators, and keepers of the mentioned herbaria. The author received financial support through an Academy of Finland grant to Hanna Tuomisto.

References

Cohen, J., N. Mirotchnick & B. Leung, 2007. Thousands introduced annually: the aquarium pathway for non-indigenous plants to the St Lawrence Seaway. Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment 5: 528–532.

Daehler, C. C., 1998. The taxonomic distribution of invasive angiosperm plants: ecological insights and comparison to agricultural weeds. Biological Conservation 84: 167–180.

Haynes, R. R. & J. R. Burkhalter, 1998. A new species of Echinodorus (Alismataceae) from the United States of America. Castanea 63: 180–182.

Haynes, R. R. & C. B. Hellquist, 2000. 190 Alismataceae Ventenant. In Flora of North America Editorial Committee (ed.), Flora of North America North of Mexico, Volume 22, Magnoliophyta: Alismatidae, Arecidae, Commelinidae (in part), and Zingiberidae. Oxford University Press, New York: 7–25.

Hijmans, R. J., S. E. Cameron, J. L. Parra, P. G. Jones & A. Javis, 2005. Very high resolution interpolated climate surfaces for global land areas. International Journal of Climatology 25: 1965–1978.

Kasselmann, C., 2001. Echinodorus, die beliebtesten Aqua-riepflanzen. Ettlingen, Da¨hne Verlag.

Kay, S. H. & S. T. Hoyle, 2001. Mail order, the internet, and invasive aquatic weeds. Journal of Aquatic Plant Man-agement 39: 88–91.

Keller, R. P. & D. M. Lodge, 2007. Species invasions from commerce in live aquatic organisms: problems and pos-sible solutions. Bioscience 57: 428–436.

Lehtonen, S., 2006. Phylogenetics of Echinodorus (Alismata-ceae) based on morphological data. Botanical Journal of the Linnean Society 150: 291–305.

123

112 Hydrobiologia (2009) 635:107–112

Lehtonen, S., 2008. An integrative approach to species delimi-tation in Echinodorus (Alismataceae) and the description of two new species. Kew Bulletin 63: 525–563.

Lehtonen, S. & L. Myllys, 2008. Cladistic analysis of Echi-nodorus (Alismataceae): simultaneous analysis of molec-ular and morphological data. Cladistics 24: 218–239.

Lehtonen, S. & L. A. Rodrı´guez Are´valo, 2005. Notes on aquarium plant production in Peruvian Amazonia. Eth-nobotany Research & Applications 3: 209–214.

Les, D. H. & L. J. Mehrhoff, 1999. Introduction of nonindig-enous aquatic vascular plants in southern New England: a historical perspective. Biological Invasions 1: 281–300.

Maki, K. & S. Galatowitsch, 2004. Movement of invasive aquatic plants into Minnesota (USA) through horticultural trade. Biological Conservation 118: 389–396.

McLane, W. M., 1969. The aquatic plant business in relation to infestations of exotic aquatic plants in Florida waters. Hyacinth Control Journal 8: 48–49.

Peterson, A. T. & D. A. Vieglais, 2001. Predicting species invasions using ecological niche modeling: new approa-ches from bioinformatics attack a pressing problem. Bioscience 51: 363–371.

Phillips, S. J. & M. Dudı´k, 2008. Modeling of species distri-butions with Maxent: new extensions and a comprehen-sive evaluation. Ecography 31: 161–175.

Phillips, S. J., R. P. Anderson & R. E. Schapire, 2006. Maxi-mum entropy modeling of species geographic distribu-tions. Ecological Modelling 190: 231–259.

Rataj, K., 1970. Las Alismataceae de la Repu´blica Argentina.

Darwiniana 16: 9–39.

Rataj, K., 1978. Alismataceae of Brazil. Acta Amazonica 8: 5–51.

Ridings, W. H. & F. W. Zettler, 1973. Aphanomyces blight of amazon sword plants. Phytopathology 63: 289–295.

Seehausen, O., G. Takimoto, D. Roy & J. Jokela, 2008. Speci-ation reversal and biodiversity dynamics with hybridization in changing environments. Molecular Ecology 17: 30–44.

Thiers, B., continuously updated. Index Herbariorum: A Global Directory of Public Herbaria and Associated Staff. New York Botanical Garden’s Virtual Herbarium. [http://sweet](http://sweetgum.nybg.org/ih/) [gum.nybg.org/ih/](http://sweetgum.nybg.org/ih/).

123