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| Authors | Year | Paper type | Topic | Species | Key findings |
| O’Loughlin & Green | 2017 | Review | Secondary invasion | - | Primary invasions, or species presence, can facilitate secondary invasions via environment modification |
| Simberloff & Von Holle | 1999 | Meta-analysis | Invasional meltdowns | - | Analysed frequencies of invasional meltdowns- characterised invader interactions and examples in plant/pollinator, plant/disperser/prey, environmental modification and soil legacies in co-invasion. |
| Rivett | 2018 | Research article | Co-selection, PE | Bacteria, natural community | Increased invader diversity increased co-invasion success into communities. Positive pairwise effects decreased with increasing invasion delay (PE). |
| Lu et al. | 2018 | Research article | Co-selection | Plant, soil microbiome | Weak evidence of top-down co-selection. Invasion success of dominant species increased in presence of rarer species (bottom-up) |
| Ames et al. | 1991 | Research article | Co-selection | Rhizobia, mycorrhizal fungi, cowpea | In non-sterile soil, two rhizobia sp. significantly improved cowpea growth when paired with mycorrhizae. Specific sp. interactions. |
| Lawrence et al. | 2012 | Research article | Co-selection | Beech tea microbes | Species A-C growth depended on the presence of at least one other species. Species D was adapted to the background media |
| Ren et al. | 2013 | Research article | Co-selection, synergy | Soil microbiomes | Stenotropomonas rhizophilia, Xanthomonas retroflexus, Microbacterium oxydans and Paenibacillus amylolyticus form multi-species biofilms which have >300% greater biomass to single species biofilms |
| Ren et al. | 2015 | Research article | Co-selection, synergy | Soil microbiomes | Follow up to above. Biofilms were dominated by X. retroflexus but success of biofilm (biomass) is critically dependent on the presence of rare species (bottom-up co-selection) |
| Rigg et al. | 2016 | Research article | Co-selection, ecosystem engineering | Wollemi pine, soil microbes | Soil microbiomes did not affect the establishment of pine. However, over time, pine altered bacterial and fungi communities within the soil and root systems- the fungi communities were distinct from the surrounding environment. |
| Rúa et al. | 2016 | Research article | Ecosystem engineering | Conifers, bacterial endophyte and fungal ectomycorrhizal communities | Relationships between specific fungi species and bacterial communities. Cortinarius I was significant in structuring the endophyte community. Sarcosphaera was also important but both species were not simultaneously important. This further depended on environmental conditions. |
| Coyte et al. | 2015 | Model | Microbiome stability | - | Positive species interactions decrease stability by creating positive feedbacks. Negative interactions (e.g. competition) results in instability through negative feedbacks. Hosts can modulate interactions to promote stability. |
| Shade et al. | 2012 | Review | Microbial community stability | - | Definitions of stability (resistance to change) and disturbance (inducers of change- direct and indirect). Measures of stability- Disturbance response, invasion resistance. Ecological and evolutionary indicators inc diversity and networks. |
| Wei et al. | 2015 | Research article | Microbial community stability | *Ralstonia solanacearum, Ralstonia* spp., tomato plants | Community networks are a better predictor of invasion resistance than diversity- low nestedness, high connectance, niche overlap. Niche overlap less important- intra-community competition and resource use important. Diversity also linked invasion resistance outside of resource use- other mechanisms as well. |
| Eiler et al. | 2012 | Research article | Microbial community stability | Bacterioplankton | Co-occurrence of bacterial groups over temporal environmental shifts. Networks established between groups. Closely related phylogenetic groups- high functional redundancy/ similar ecological roles. Shifts in groups in response to environment. Competitive interactions for phosphorus. High numbers of associations suggestive of interdependencies. |
| Johnson et al. | 2009 | Research article | Invader interactions | Crayfish, snails | Rusty crayfish predates on native snails. Chinese mystery snails compete with native snails. Combined invaders decrease natives in an effect greater than as individuals. Rusty crayfish only weakly predated on CMS due to greater predation resistance. |
| Buric et al. | 2009 | Research article | Invader interactions | Crayfish | Two invasive species of crayfish predated on one another- one more dominant |
| Preston et al. | 2012 | Research article | Invader interactions | Mosquitofish, bullfrogs, amphbians | Mosquitofish (-) on treefrog and newt survival, no effect on toads. Toads developed more rapidly with MF. Bullfrogs decreased toad biomass. No direct invader interaction. |
| Barthell et al. | 2001 | Research article | Invader interactions | Invasive honeybee and yellow star-thistle (*Cebtaurea solstitialis*) | Honeybees dominant visitors of thistle. Seed set number coincided with treatments facilitating highest/lowest honeybee visitation. Mutualistic invader interaction. |
| Green et al. | 2011 | Research article | Invader interactions | Yellow crazy ant (*Anoplolepis gracilipes*), honeydew- secreting scale insects (*Tachardinia aurantiaca*) and giant African land snails | Invader-invader mutualism between YCA and HSI increased secondary invasion success of GALS by killing GALS predator, red land crabs. This increased GALS propagule pressure, thus increasing invasion success. |
| Groscholz | 2005 | Research article | Invader interactions | Crabs, clams | Introduced crab species preferentially predates on native clams and facilitates the historic (50 yr) population expansion of an invasive clam species. |