

# Biological Invasions

## Are native plants always better for wildlife than invasives? Insights from a community-level bird-exclusion experiment --Manuscript Draft--

Manuscript Number:	BINV-D-23-00330	
Full Title:	Are native plants always better for wildlife than invasives? Insights from a community-level bird-exclusion experiment	
Article Type:	Research paper	
Keywords:	invasive species; invasive plants; insectivores; songbirds; forests; food webs	
Corresponding Author:	Robert E Clark Washington State University UNITED STATES	
Corresponding Author Secondary Information:		
Corresponding Author's Institution:	Washington State University	
Corresponding Author's Secondary Institution:		
First Author:	Robert E Clark	
First Author Secondary Information:		
Order of Authors:	Robert E Clark Wales A Carter Timothy C.W. Ku Chad L Seewagen	
Order of Authors Secondary Information:		
Funding Information:	Great Hollow Nature Preserve & Ecological Research Center	Not applicable
Abstract:	<p>Biological invasions can threaten biodiversity by outcompeting native species and disrupting food webs. Invasive species are now a leading driver of biodiversity and imperiled species declines worldwide. In temperate forests of eastern North America, understory plant communities are frequently dominated by invasive woody shrubs and trees. For many species of insectivorous birds and mammals, these invasive plants may threaten populations by providing less and/or lower quality food. Conservation practitioners expend significant resources to remove invasive plants, but evidence that such practices improve food abundance or quality to wildlife is surprisingly limited. Using a bird exclusion experiment, we compared arthropod abundance, biomass, and quality (protein content), and bird foraging intensity among four invasive and six native woody plant species in a Connecticut, USA forest. Analysis revealed instances where native trees were actually poorer foraging resources for songbirds than certain species of invasive shrubs. Some invasive species, such as honeysuckle (<i>Lonicera morrowii</i>), supported higher arthropod biomass and protein content than the native plants. Conversely, Japanese barberry had fewer arthropods overall and arthropods of lower protein quality compared to native shrubs. Contrary to predictions from other food web experiments, bird predation effects were of similar magnitude on native and invasive plants, demonstrating that insectivorous songbirds foraged as intensively on the invasive plants as they did on the native plants. We recommend a more nuanced, regionally tailored and species-specific approach to invasive plant management that targets species that provide low-quality foraging opportunities relative to the quality of the local native plant community.</p>	
Suggested Reviewers:	Marylyse Duguid Yale University marlyse.duguid@yale.edu	

	Carla D'Antonio University of California Santa Barbara dantonio@es.ucsb.edu
	Erika Zavaleta University of California Santa Cruz zavaleta@ucsc.edu
	Laura Meyerson University of Rhode Island lameyerson@uri.edu

[Click here to view linked References](#)

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 *Biological Invasions* Research Paper

2 Title:

3 Are native plants always better for wildlife than invasives? Insights from a community-level  
4 bird-exclusion experiment

6 Author(s):

7 Robert E. Clark<sup>\*1,2,3</sup>, Wales A. Carter<sup>1</sup>, Timothy C.W. Ku<sup>4</sup>, and Chad L. Seewagen<sup>1</sup>

8

9 Affiliations:

10 <sup>1</sup> Great Hollow Nature Preserve & Ecological Research Center, 225 State Route 37

11 New Fairfield, CT USA

12 <sup>2</sup> EcoData Technology LLC, 59 Lagana Ave, Plantsville CT USA

13 <sup>3</sup> Washington State University, Department of Entomology, 100 Dairy Road

14 Pullman, WA USA

15 <sup>4</sup> Wesleyan University, Department of Earth & Environmental Sciences, 45 Wyllys Ave,

16 Middletown, CT USA

17 \* Corresponding author: robert.e.clark@wsu.edu

18

19 Keywords:

20 Invasive species, invasive plants, insectivores, songbirds, forests, food webs

21

22

23

Abstract:

Biological invasions can threaten biodiversity by outcompeting native species and disrupting food webs. Invasive species are now a leading driver of biodiversity and imperiled species declines worldwide. In temperate forests of eastern North America, understory plant communities are frequently dominated by invasive woody shrubs and trees. For many species of insectivorous birds and mammals, these invasive plants may threaten populations by providing less and/or lower quality food. Conservation practitioners expend significant resources to remove invasive plants, but evidence that such practices improve food abundance or quality to wildlife is surprisingly limited. Using a bird exclusion experiment, we compared arthropod abundance, biomass, and quality (protein content), and bird foraging intensity among four invasive and six native woody plant species in a Connecticut, USA forest. Analysis revealed instances where native trees were actually poorer foraging resources for songbirds than certain species of invasive shrubs. Some invasive species, such as honeysuckle (*Lonicera morrowii*), supported higher arthropod biomass and protein content than the native plants. Conversely, Japanese barberry had fewer arthropods overall and arthropods of lower protein quality compared to native shrubs. Contrary to predictions from other food web experiments, bird predation effects were of similar magnitude on native and invasive plants, demonstrating that insectivorous songbirds foraged as intensively on the invasive plants as they did on the native plants. We recommend a more nuanced, regionally tailored and species-specific approach to invasive plant management that targets species that provide low-quality foraging opportunities relative to the quality of the local native plant community.

Introduction:

Invasive species are widely considered to be a leading cause of global biodiversity decline (Bellard et al. 2016). In the United States alone, invasive species are estimated to also cause a yearly average of \$19.9 billion in economic losses (Fantle-Lepczyk et al. 2021) and \$120 billion is annually spent on their management (Pimentel et al. 2007). Invasive plants are particularly challenging to manage in terrestrial ecosystems, with the cost of removal efforts still being difficult to estimate accurately for the U.S. or globally (Rai et al. 2022). Nevertheless, the costs of invasive plant management have not been trivial when quantified, reaching average annual totals of \$82 million in California (California Invasive Plant Council, 2022) and \$45 million in Florida (Hiatt et al. 2019). However, despite dramatic efforts to remove invasive plants, there is still not a consensus on whether such practices actually benefit wildlife communities (Robichaud et al. 2021, Traylor et al. 2022). In some cases, invasive plant removal can even have unintended negative consequences (Zavaleta et al. 2001, Lehtinen et al. 2022). Consequently, invasive plant removal should consider whether these intensive activities are justified on a case-by-case basis (D'Antonio and Meyerson 2002). Since conservation resources are severely limited relative to the impact of invasive species, prioritization control on the most impactful invasives is necessary (Arponen 2012, Courtois et al. 2018, Eppinga et al. 2021).

Invasive plant management emphasizes physical or chemical removal to restore ecological dynamics prior to invasion. In principle, removing or otherwise killing invasive plants improves habitat quality for native plants (Hartman and McCarthy, 2004) and native wildlife (Schneider and Miller, 2014). One target for invasive plant removal is to allow native plants to reestablish, which will provide more food resources to wildlife. Such practice is justified since removal of particularly aggressive invasive plant species can drive recovery of arthropod assemblages, which are an important food source for songbirds (Gratton and Denno, 2005,

Hopfensperger et al. 2017). Native plants are recommended as replacements for exotic shrubs to provide more insect prey for birds (Narango et al. 2018, Kramer et al. 2019, Tallamy et al. 2020). Furthermore, invasive plants are assumed to be disruptive in ecological restoration efforts since invasive species are prevalent in already degraded habitats with a history of intensive land-use practices (Mosher et al. 2009, Wang et al. 2016, Seebens et al. 2017, Holmes et al. 2021).

Typically, invasive plants dominate or form monocultures and displace native plant species, negatively impacting native animals indirectly (McCary et al. 2016, Fletcher et al. 2019). Some studies have shown lower quality arthropod prey is available to insectivorous birds and mammals in habitats dominated by invasive plants (Gerber et al. 2008, Riedl et al. 2018). The ecological mechanisms by which invasive plants impact arthropods are many: compounds released from invasive plants through roots and decaying leaves can impact detritus-based food webs (Robison et al. 2021), while the atypical architecture of invasive plants modifies the behavior of arthropod communities (Pearson 2009, Lind and Parker 2010, Landsman et al. 2021).

In managed forests, invasive plant removal is typically conducted without active restoration of native plants and relies on local native plants to move into recently cleared areas on their own (Flory and Clay 2009, Shields et al. 2015, Farmer et al. 2016, Cutway 2017). Removal is suggested since habitats dominated by invasive plants often have lower abundances of plant-feeding arthropods which could be prey for birds, particularly caterpillars or spiders (Richard et al. 2019, Clark and Seewagen 2019). A critical gap in regional management of invasive plants is establishing whether a target invasive species indeed provides lower quality food resources to birds compared to the alternative native woody plants in the same habitat patch.

Our study involved a comparison of invasive and native members of a plant community within a Connecticut, USA mature forest. We tested three hypotheses: (1) the ‘weaker predatory effects hypothesis’, (2) the ‘low food quantity hypothesis’, and (3) the ‘low food quality hypothesis’. In the weaker predatory effects hypothesis, insectivores are predicted to forage on invasive plants less than native plants because of lower prey abundance and quality (Riedl et al. 2018), which will be manifested as weaker top-down effects on insect prey. In the low food quantity hypothesis, an invasive plant species is expected to have significantly less prey available for insectivores compared to native plants coexisting in the same habitat patch. In the ‘low food quality’ hypothesis, prey items that are available on invasive plants are expected to have lower nutritional value (e.g., lower protein content) resulting from being low-quality food sources for herbivorous arthropods (Lieurance and Cipollini 2013, Haan et al. 2021, Lampert et al. 2022). We tested all three hypotheses through a predator exclusion experiment on four intensively managed invasive woody plant species of the northeastern, U.S., using a set of six common, co-occurring native plants as a comparison point.

#### Methods:

*Study System.* We performed a selective predator exclusion experiment on ten woody host plant species at Great Hollow Nature Preserve in New Fairfield, Connecticut, USA (41.507998 N, -73.530032 W). The preserve is 334 ha and comprised predominantly of mature, closed-canopy, second-growth deciduous and mixed forest. Historic disturbance of the land, mostly from past agricultural uses, has favored the establishment of many of the invasive plants that are now ubiquitous to the northeastern U.S. and often aggressively targeted for removal by land managers and conservation practitioners. We focused our experiment on a subset of these

1  
2  
3  
4 116 invasive plants: Japanese barberry (*Berberis thunbergii*), Morrow's honeysuckle (*Lonicera*  
5  
6 117 *morrowii*), burning bush (*Eunonymous alatus*), and autumn olive (*Eleagnus umbellata*). These  
7  
8  
9 118 four species are designated as invasive by the Connecticut Invasive Plants Council, formed *via*  
10  
11 119 Connecticut General Statutes §22a-381a through §22a-381d (<https://cipwg.uconn.edu/ipc/>). For  
12  
13  
14 120 comparison, we chose six native woody plants that co-occur with these invasive shrubs and are  
15  
16 121 the most dominant native trees in the understory of our study system: striped maple (*Acer*  
17  
18 122 *pennsylvanicum*), shadbush (*Amelanchier canadensis*), musclewood (*Carpinus caroliniana*),  
19  
20 123 witch-hazel (*Hamamelis virginiana*), sweet birch (*Betula lenta*), and American beech (*Fagus*  
21  
22 124 *grandifolia*). Performing our experiment across these 10 species thus provided a community-  
23  
24  
25 125 wide perspective on the impacts of invasive plants on food webs, in the context in which  
26  
27  
28 126 invasive plant management decisions should be made (Westman 1990).

29  
30  
31 127 *Bird exclusion experiment.* From 4-27 May, 2021, we set up a predator exclusion  
32  
33 128 experiment in a paired design following Singer et al. (2012). Briefly, insectivorous birds were  
34  
35 129 prevented from foraging on branches of our 10 study species *via* mesh netting (Bird-X Protective  
36  
37 130 Netting, Elmhurst, IL, USA) that was folded and sown into a bag that was slid over a single  
38  
39 131 branch of a target plant, and affixed using plastic zip-ties ("exclusion treatment"). Each of these  
40  
41 132 branches was paired with a nearby (< 10 m away) unmanipulated control branch of the same  
42  
43 133 species. We set up 12 treatment pairs for each of the 10 focal plant species, resulting in a total of  
44  
45 134 240 individual host plants in the study. At the end of the set-up period on 27 May, all 240  
46  
47 135 branches were struck with a 0.3 m wooden dowel to dislodge arthropods and reset colonization  
48  
49 136 to avoid bias caused by the disturbance of setting up the exclusion netting. After a 2-wk waiting  
50  
51 137 period, we then sampled foliage-foraging arthropods with a branch-beating technique (Wagner  
52  
53 138 2005) every other week from 24 May until 2 July, to coincide with the peak breeding period of  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65



most forest birds in our region. We struck each branch with a 0.3 m dowel while held over a 1m<sup>2</sup> ripstop fabric beat sheet and collected all invertebrates from the beat sheet into plastic vials or plastic zip-top bags using aspirators or soft-touch aluminum forceps. Each branch was sampled this way three times with 14 d between samples. We kept the collected arthropods cool in the field in coolers with ice packs and then transferred them to a -80° C freezer at the end of each day.

*Taxonomic identification of arthropods.* We combined the three repeated samples from a given branch to provide a tally of total arthropod abundance (Clark et al. 2016) and then weighed (wet mass) the arthropods together on a 10<sup>-4</sup> g microbalance. After identifying all invertebrates from a given branch to class, we sorted all insects in the orders Lepidoptera, Hemiptera, Hymenoptera to family. We identified true spiders (Araneae) and Opiliones to family as well. Following identification, we transferred each taxonomic group from a given branch to separate 0.6-2 mL Eppendorf tubes and stored them at -80° C. In all, the four numerically dominant taxonomic groupings of arthropods included (1) Lepidoptera (caterpillars), (2) true spiders (Araneae), (3) herbivorous Hemiptera families (Aphidae, Cicadellidae, Membracidae, Miridae, and Pentatomidae), and (4) Orthoptera (families Gryllidae and Tettigoniidae).

*Elemental analysis of arthropods.* As an indicator of arthropod quality as prey for songbirds, we used elemental analysis to compare the protein content (percent elemental Nitrogen) of arthropods collected from native plants and invasive plants (Smets et al. 2021). Protein is a macronutrient that strongly mediates food selection by breeding birds and is critical to offspring development (Klasing 1998, Birkhead et al. 1999, Robbins et al. 2005, Razeng and Watson 2015). Our preliminary analyses suggested that two broad functional groups responded strongly to bird predation effects and varied significantly among native and invasive host plants,

each representing a different trophic level above host plants: foliage-feeding herbivores (see Online Resource 1, Fig S1-S3) and predatory true spiders (Araneae). These two groupings of arthropods are prey for foliage-gleaning, insectivorous birds, should differ in protein content because of their different trophic levels (Reeves et al. 2021), and are impacted by experimental manipulation of bird predation (Gunnarsson et al. 1996). Generally, insects feeding on plants have a similar C:N ratio as their host (Abbas et al. 2014). To assay elemental composition, we first pooled foliage-feeding herbivore taxa and true spiders across sampling periods for each branch in the bird exclusion treatment group. We limited our analyses to branches with birds excluded to quantify the nutritional quality of the arthropod community as it would be for the first bird foraging on a given branch. We then oven-dried arthropod samples at 60° C to a constant mass and homogenized any samples that weighed > 3 mg. Samples (1.5-3.5 mg) were measured for carbon and nitrogen concentrations on a Flash 1112 CHNSO elemental analyzer (CE Elantech inc. Lakewood, NJ, USA) by comparing results with aspartic acid and L-cystine standards. We analyzed replicates for a subset of branches, producing mean within-sample coefficients of variation of 4.2% for nitrogen and 2.9% for carbon.


*Statistical analyses.* We employed a series of Generalized Linear Mixed Models (GLMMs) using the *lme4* package (Bates et al. 2015) in R version 4.1.2 (R Development Core Team, 2022). We included the following as response variables for successive models: (1) total arthropod biomass sampled per plant, (2) spider abundance (Araneae), (3) caterpillar abundance (Lepidoptera), (4) herbivorous true bug abundance (Hemiptera) (5) tree cricket and katydid abundance (Orthoptera) (6) N content of herbivorous insects and (7) N content of spiders. Arthropod biomass was fitted as a normally distributed GLMM after log-transformation and included both host plant species and bird exclusion treatment as fixed effects, and branch as a

random effect. All abundance models were fitted with a negative binomial GLMM. In abundance models, invasive status (yes or no) was a fixed effect along with bird-exclusion treatment, and branch and host-plant species were included as random effects. Samples taken across the three sampling periods were pooled together in arthropod models to avoid pseudoreplication (Clark et al. 2016). Nitrogen content models were fit with a normal distribution, but since all arthropod samples were pooled across sampling periods and only taken from exclusion branches, only host-plant species was used as a main effect (GLM). Post-hoc tests comparing changes in biomass, abundance, and nitrogen content were run using the *emmeans* package in R (Lenth 2016). Differences were investigated between pooled native plants and each individual invasive plant using Dunnett's method for P-value adjustment in unplanned contrasts. P-values and critical values were determined using the *car* package with analysis of deviance tests and  $\chi^2$  test statistics (Fox et al 2015).


*Log-response ratios.* A follow-up GLM was employed using LRRs (log-response ratios) of exclusion treatments to investigate the interspecific variation in bird predation effects across all host plant species (Singer et al. 2012). LRRs, when used to evaluate the effects of natural enemy exclusion, provide insight into whether the interaction strength of top-down effects vary according to different environmental variables (Chaguaceda et al. 2021, Wootton 1997). In this case, we used a LRR modified from Hedges et al. (1999) as the natural log of the combined arthropod biomass on exclusion branches divided by the arthropod biomass on control branches. LLR calculated in this way tests the prediction that bird predation is weaker on invasive plants, testing the predictions of the 'weaker predatory effects hypothesis'.

Results:

We observed significant variation in total arthropod biomass among our ten focal host-plant species (Fig. S4, GLMM,  $P = 0.001$ ,  $\chi^2 = 26.62$ , d.f. = 9). Collectively, invasive plants did not have significantly lower biomass than surrounding native plants in Dunnett's tests (vs autumn olive:  $P = 0.27$ , vs barberry:  $P = 0.21$ , vs burning bush:  $P = 0.28$ , vs honeysuckle:  $P = 0.56$ , Fig. 1, Table S1). Honeysuckle had higher biomass than the three other invasive plant species (Fig. 1D). Native plants varied in biomass, with musclewood, sweet birch and witch-hazel exhibiting relatively higher biomass than the other plants (Fig S4). We did not observe statistically significant variation among plant species in the effect size of bird predation as measured by LRR (Fig. S5, GLM,  $P = 0.294$ ,  $\chi^2 = 10.73$ , d.f. = 9). Furthermore, bird predation LLR was not significantly lower on any invasive species compared to the native species group in Dunnett's tests (vs autumn olive:  $P = 0.99$ , vs barberry:  $P = 0.38$ , vs burning bush:  $P = 0.94$ , vs honeysuckle:  $P = 0.99$ , Fig 2, Table S2). Bird predation reduced biomass of arthropods on all plant species except musclewood (Fig. S6). Musclewood branches were associated with relatively high occupancy of aquatic insect orders (Fig S1).



**Fig. 1** Arthropod biomass (total grams per branch) with pooled comparisons between native plants and each invasive plant species. Biomass is reported as total wet mass collected from branches. Mean  $\pm$  SEM is plotted, with levels of significance illustrated for native versus each invasive plant species using grouped, planned contrasts.




**Fig. 2** Effect size of bird exclusion treatment showing pooled comparisons between native plants and each invasive plant species. Bird exclusion effect size reported as Log-Response Ratios (LRR), in which positive values > 0 indicate a significant reduction in arthropod abundance in response to bird predation. Mean  $\pm$  SEM is plotted, with levels of significance illustrated for natives versus invasive plant species using grouped, planned contrasts.

Bird predation effects on abundance of arthropods among native and invasive plants differed for each taxonomic group. Araneae abundance was higher on invasive plants overall (Fig. S6A, GLMM,  $P < 0.001$ ,  $\chi^2 = 19.19$ , d.f. = 1), while bird effects on Araneae abundance were significant on both native and invasive plants (Fig. S6A, GLMM,  $P < 0.001$ ,  $\chi^2 = 57.18$ , d.f. = 1). Hemiptera abundance was not significantly different between native and invasive plants (Fig S6B, GLMM,  $P = 0.488$ ,  $\chi^2 = 0.479$ , d.f. = 1), and bird predation did not significantly reduce Hemipteran abundance (Fig. S6B, GLMM,  $P = 0.141$ ,  $\chi^2 = 2.15$ , d.f. = 1). Bird predation effects were significant for Lepidoptera (Fig. S6C, GLMM,  $P < 0.001$ ,  $\chi^2 = 25.7$ , d.f. = 1) and although there were fewer Lepidoptera on invasive plants (Fig. S6C, GLMM,  $P = 0.022$ ,  $\chi^2 = 5.19$ , d.f. = 1), bird predation effects on Lepidoptera did not significantly differ between natives and invasives (GLMM interaction term for native vs. invasive plants and bird predation effect,  $P = 0.614$ ,  $\chi^2 = 0.25$ , d.f. = 1). Finally, we observed similar abundances of Orthoptera on both native and invasive plants (Fig. S6D, GLMM,  $P = 0.941$ ,  $\chi^2 = 0.005$ , d.f. = 1). Birds significantly reduced the abundance of orthoptera on both plant groups (Fig. S6D, GLMM,  $P < 0.001$ ,  $\chi^2 = 15.6$ , d.f. = 1).

We observed significant variation in the %N content by mass for herbivores among host plants (Fig. S7, GLM,  $P < 0.001$ ,  $\chi^2 = 38.4$ , d.f. = 9). A Dunnett's test showed significantly higher %N content by mass on honeysuckle compared to native plants (Fig 3A,  $P < 0.001$ , Table S3), and %N content was higher on honeysuckle than any other plant (Fig S7). Other invasive plants were not significantly different to the native group (vs autumn olive:  $P = 0.19$ , vs barberry:  $P = 0.99$ , vs burning bush:  $P = 0.88$ , Figure 3, Table S3). Spider %N content varied significantly among plants overall (Fig. S8, GLM,  $P < 0.001$ ,  $\chi^2 = 59.61$ , d.f. = 9), with lower


values on Japanese barberry than native plants (Fig 4B,  $P < 0.001$ , Table S4). Spider %N content was dramatically lower on Japanese barberry than any other plant species (Fig S8), while other invasive plants were not significantly different to the native group (vs autumn olive:  $P = 0.08$ , vs burning bush:  $P = 0.96$ , vs honeysuckle:  $P = 0.98$ , Figure 4, Table S4).



**Fig. 3** Total % nitrogen for insect herbivores on bird-exclusion branches. Nitrogen content is measured as the total molecular mass of elemental nitrogen relative to total mass of a single



sample from an experimental host-plant branch. Mean  $\pm$  SEM is plotted, with levels of significance illustrated for natives versus invasive plant species using grouped, planned contrasts.



**Fig. 4** Total % nitrogen for true spiders on bird-exclusion branches. Nitrogen content is measured as the total molecular mass of elemental nitrogen relative to total mass of a single sample from an experimental host-plant branch. Mean  $\pm$  SEM is plotted, with levels of

significance illustrated for natives versus invasive plant species using grouped, planned contrasts.

## Discussion:

The prevailing paradigm in habitat management and restoration assumes that all invasive plants are of little value or harmful to native wildlife. However, this broad-brush approach is based on region-specific case studies in which a single invasive plant is compared to a high-quality native plant, underemphasizing any contributions an invasive plant may make to biodiversity (Schlaepfer 2018). Recent perspective surveys of conservation biologists and practitioners reveal conflicting opinions about impacts as being the criteria for ‘invasiveness’ rather than spread alone (Shakleton et al. 2020). Here, we found multiple lines of evidence to suggest common invasive plants in our study system are comparable to the dominant native plants in their value as foraging resources for insectivorous birds. Arthropod biomass and protein content, and bird foraging intensity were broadly similar between native and non-native plants that are major components of northeastern U.S. forests. Our results suggest that it should first be demonstrated, not assumed, that a given non-native, invasive plant is of inferior quality to surrounding native plants before extensive removal efforts are made— an approach proposed as early as Westman (1990). Given the tremendous drive for invasive plant removal in our region, we were surprised to see some invasive plants supporting comparable abundances and protein-rich arthropod prey for songbirds. Moreover, songbirds appear to be foraging on these invasive plants with similar intensity, with significant bird predation effects found on both invasive and native plants. While our study does not suggest invasive plants have no negative ecological

consequences, it highlights that some invasive plants should be prioritized over others depending on the habitat in question.

Few studies have evaluated the simultaneous value of arthropod prey in terms of both quantity and quality at a plant community level. The results of our holistic approach revealed not all invasive plants are equally disruptive to trophic interactions between forest plants, arthropods, and insectivorous birds. To this point, our study showed surprisingly more arthropod prey on honeysuckle (*Lonicera*) compared to natives, failing to support the ‘low food quantity hypothesis’. Furthermore, support for the ‘low food quality hypothesis’ was mixed, with extremely variable arthropod protein content across invasive and native plants. We anticipated that herbivorous insects would be significantly lower in protein content on invasive plants, but found no evidence for this assertion. Investigation of host plant-specific patterns suggest that the variance in food quality on invasive plants encompasses the range of quality of food found on native plants in the same habitat.

We found that common invasive plants in our study system are used as a foraging substrate by a major group of forest insectivores, birds, just as intensively as natives. The similar predation effect sizes we observed between invasive and native plants were unexpected given two established mechanisms that cause invasive plants to have different arthropod communities. First, leaf tissue is of lower quality or more highly defended than on native plants, reducing biomass of arthropods on invasive plants (van Hengstum et al. 2014). Second, the branch architecture or leaf shape of invasive plants provide novel microhabitat for arthropods and thus create a distinct community from those found on native plants (Bultman and DeWitt 2007, Landsman et al. 2021). Spider abundance was higher on low-lying Japanese barberry, similar to other observations with invasive plants like Japanese stiltgrass (Landsman et al. 2020).

One of the gaps in past research on invasive plant invasions is the limited ability of previous studies to assess how much invader-driven changes in arthropod communities translate into altered interactions between arthropods and their predators. Our study allowed us to investigate this question by combining quantification of the arthropod community on a range of host plants with a predator exclusion experiment to quantify top-down effects. Moreover, we considered trends in broad taxonomic groups, which can be informative for aggregating effects over complex systems (*sensu* Wagner et al. 2021). Accordingly, differences in nitrogen content of caterpillars and spiders ranged from around 0.5% in aggregate to 1% in specific contrasts. These differences in nitrogen content translate to differences in protein content of approximately 3 – 6% (McDonald et al. 2011, Smets et al. 2021), which, while not extreme, are detectable by songbirds and can affect their body condition (Bairlein 1998, Klasing 1998, Razeng and Watson 2015). However, it is unknown whether there are any notable downstream nutritional consequences of shifts in arthropod abundance and nitrogen content for songbirds, even in the absence of changes in predatory behavior.

Current management practices attempt to ameliorate the impacts of invasive plants on wildlife through physical or chemical removal (Weidlich et al. 2020). However, our results suggest that the native plant community is a critical comparison point. Our study site did not include *Prunus* (cherries) and *Quercus* (oaks), which are known to be high-quality food plants for forest insects like caterpillars (Wagner 2005), because they are regenerating poorly and declining in many northeastern forests (including our study site) due to a variety of factors (e.g., deer over-browsing). One of the key priorities for invasive species research includes understanding the context of the invaded habitat (Ricciardi et al. 2021), and thus we chose for comparison the native trees and shrubs that are dominant or becoming dominant in our region's

1  
2  
3  
4 341 forests. Our study suggests removal of invasive plants must be paired with restoration of these  
5  
6 342 higher-quality native plants, especially since the process of physical or chemical removal of  
7  
8  
9 343 invasive plants can have unintended, negative impacts (Kettenring and Adams 2001). For  
10  
11 344 management, the relative value of removing an invasive shrub should depend on the particular  
12  
13  
14 345 pairwise comparisons being made at a given site, as well as the density of invasive shrubs (Tarr  
15  
16 346 2022). Overall, our results suggest that a more nuanced management strategy for habitat  
17  
18  
19 347 improvement goals in eastern North American forests where the species identity is considered  
20  
21 348 against the backdrop of surrounding native plants.  
22  
23

#### 24 349 25 26 350 References:

- 27  
28 351 Abbas M, Klein A-M, Ebeling A, Oelmann Y, Ptacnik R, Weisser WW, Hillebrand H (2014)  
29  
30 352 Plant Diversity Effects on Pollinating and Herbivorous Insects can be Linked to Plant  
31  
32  
33 353 Stoichiometry. *Basic Appl Ecol* 15:169–178.  
34  
35 354 Arponen A (2012) Prioritizing Species for Conservation Planning. *Biodivers Conserv* 21:875–  
36  
37 355 893.  
38  
39  
40 356 Bairlein F (1998) The Effect of Diet Composition on Migratory Fuelling in Garden Warblers  
41  
42 357 *Sylvia borin*. *J Avian Biol* 29:546–551.  
43  
44  
45 358 Bates D, Mächler M, Bolker B, Walker S (2015) Fitting Linear Mixed-Effects Models Using  
46  
47 359 lme4. *J Stat Softw* 67:1–48.  
48  
49  
50 360 Bellard C, Cassey P, Blackburn TM (2016) Alien Species as A Driver of Recent Extinctions.  
51  
52 361 *Biol Lett* 12:20150623.  
53  
54  
55 362 Birkhead TR, Fletcher F, Pellatt EF (1999) Nestling Diet, Secondary Sexual Traits, and Fitness  
56  
57 363 in the Zebra Finch. *Proc R Soc B: Biol Sci* 266:385 – 390.  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

- 1  
2  
3  
4 364 Bultman TL, DeWitt DJ (2007) Effect of An Invasive Ground Cover Plant on The Abundance  
5  
6  
7 365 And Diversity Of A Forest Floor Spider Assemblage. *Biol Invasions* 10:749.  
8  
9 366 Chaguaceda F, Scharnweber K, Dalman E, Tranvik LJ, Eklöv P (2021) Short-Term Apparent  
10  
11  
12 367 Mutualism Drives Responses of Aquatic Prey to Increasing Productivity. *J Anim Ecol*  
13  
14 368 90:834–845.  
15  
16 369 Clark RE, Farkas TE, Lichter-Marck I, Johnson ER, Singer MS (2016) Multiple Interaction  
17  
18  
19 370 Types Determine the Impact of Ant Predation Of Caterpillars In A Forest Community.  
20  
21 371 *Ecology* 97:3379–3388.  
22  
23 372 Clark RE, Seewagen CL (2019) Invasive Japanese Barberry, *Berberis thunbergii* (Ranunculales:  
24  
25  
26 373 Berberidaceae) Is Associated with Simplified Branch-Dwelling and Leaf-Litter  
27  
28  
29 374 Arthropod Communities in a New York Forest. *Environ Entomol* 48:1071–1078.  
30  
31 375 Courtois P, Figuières C, Mulier C, Weill J (2018) A Cost–Benefit Approach for Prioritizing  
32  
33 376 Invasive Species. *Ecol Econ* 146:607–620.  
34  
35  
36 377 Crystal-Ornelas R, Hudgins EJ, Cuthbert RN, Haubrock PJ, Fantle-Lepczyk J, Angulo E, Kramer  
37  
38 378 AM, Ballesteros-Mejia L, Leroy B, Leung B, López-López E, Diagne C, Courchamp F  
39  
40  
41 379 (2021) Economic Costs of Biol Invasions Within North America. *NeoBiota* 67:485–510.  
42  
43 380 Cutway HB (2017) Effects of Long-Term Manual Invasive Plant Removal on Forest Understory  
44  
45  
46 381 Composition. *Nat Areas J* 37:530–539.  
47  
48 382 D’Antonio C, Meyerson LA (2002) Exotic Plant Species as Problems and Solutions in  
49  
50  
51 383 Ecological Restoration: A Synthesis. *Restor Ecol* 10:703–713.  
52  
53 384 Eppinga MB, Baudena M, Haber EA, Rietkerk M, Wassen MJ, Santos MJ (2021) Spatially  
54  
55 385 Explicit Removal Strategies Increase the Efficiency Of Invasive Plant Species Control.  
56  
57  
58 386 *Ecol Appl* 31:1–13.  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

Fantle-Lepczyk JE, Haubrock PJ, Kramer AM, Cuthbert RN, Turbelin AJ, Crystal-Ornelas R,  
 Diagne C, Courchamp F (2022) Economic Costs of Biol Invasions in The United States.  
 Sci Total Environ 806:151318.

Farmer S, Ward J, Horton J, Clarke D (2016) Southern Appalachian Urban Forest Response To  
 Three Invasive Plant Removal Treatments. Manag Biol Invasions 7:329–342.

Fletcher RA, Brooks RK, Lakoba VT, Sharma G, Heminger AR, Dickinson CC, Barney JN  
 (2019) Invasive Plants Negatively Impact Native, But Not Exotic, Animals. Glob Chang  
 Biol 25:3694–3705.

Flory SL, Clay K (2009) Invasive Plant Removal Method Determines Native Plant Community  
 Responses. J Appl Ecol 46:434–442.

Fox J, Weisberg S, Adler D, Bates D, Baud-Bovy G, Ellison S, Firth D, Friendly M, Gorjanc G,  
 Graves S, Heiberger R, Laboissiere R, Monette G, Murdoch D, Nilsson H, Ogle D,  
 Ripley B, Venables W, Winsemius D, Zeileis A, R-Core (2015) car: Companion to  
 Applied Regression.

Gerber E, Krebs C, Murrell C, Moretti M, Rocklin R, Schaffner U. (2008) Exotic Invasive  
 Knotweeds (*Fallopia* spp.) Negatively Affect Native Plant and Invertebrate Assemblages  
 In European Riparian Habitats. Biol Conserv 141:646–654.

Gratton C, Denno RF (2005) Restoration of Arthropod Assemblages in a *Spartina* Salt Marsh  
 following Removal of the Invasive Plant *Phragmites australis*. Restor Ecol 13:358–372.

Haan NL, Bowers MD, Bakker JD (2021) Preference, Performance, And Chemical Defense in  
 An Endangered Butterfly Using Novel And Ancestral Host Plants. Sci Rep 11:992.

Hartman KM, McCarthy BC (2004) Restoration of a Forest Understory After the Removal of an  
 Invasive Shrub, Amur Honeysuckle (*Lonicera maackii*). Restor Ecol 12:154–165.

- 1  
2  
3  
4 410 van Hengstum, T, Hoofman DAP, Oostermeijer JGB, van Tienderen PH (2014) Impact of Plant  
5  
6 411 Invasions on Local Arthropod Communities: A Meta-Analysis. *J Ecol* 102:4–11.  
7  
8  
9 412 Hedges LV, Gurevitch J, Curtis PS (1999) The Meta-Analysis of Response Ratios in  
10  
11 413 Experimental Ecology. *Ecology* 80:1150–1156.  
12  
13  
14 414 Hiatt D, Serbesoff- King K, Lieurance D, Gordon DR, Flory SL (2019) Allocation of Invasive  
15  
16 415 Plant Management Expenditures For Conservation: Lessons from Florida, USA. *Conserv*  
17  
18  
19 416 *Sci Pract* 1:1–10.  
20  
21 417 Holmes MA, Whitacre JV, Bennion LD, Poteet J, Kuebbing SE (2021) Land-Use History and  
22  
23 418 Abiotic Gradients Drive Abundance of Non-Native Shrubs In Appalachian Second-  
24  
25  
26 419 Growth Forests With Histories Of Mining, Agriculture, And Logging. *For Ecol Manag*  
27  
28 420 494:119296.  
29  
30  
31 421 Kettenring KM, Adams CR (2011) Lessons Learned from Invasive Plant Control Experiments: A  
32  
33 422 Systematic Review And Meta-Analysis. *J Appl Ecol* 48:970–979.  
34  
35  
36 423 Klasing KC (1998) Comparative Avian Nutrition. CAB International, Wallingford, UK.  
37  
38 424 Kramer AT, Crane C, Downing J, Hamrick JL, Havens K, Highland A, Jacobi SK, Kaye TN,  
39  
40  
41 425 Lonsdorf EV, Ramp Neale J, Novy A, Smouse PE, Tallamy DW, White A, Zeldin J  
42  
43 426 (2019) Sourcing Native Plants to Support Ecosystem Function In Different Planting  
44  
45 427 Contexts. *Restor Ecol* 27:470–476.  
46  
47  
48 428 Lampert EC, Cylkowski ZR, McDonough KA, Young CR (2022) Arthropod Associations Show  
49  
50 429 Naturalization with Non-Native *Quercus* Species in the Georgia Piedmont. *J Entomol Sci*  
51  
52 430 57:323–332.  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65



- 1  
2  
3  
4 431 Landsman AP, Schmit JP, Matthews ER (2021) Invasive Plants Differentially Impact Forest  
5  
6  
7 432 Invertebrates, Providing Taxon-Specific Benefits by Enhancing Structural Complexity.  
8  
9 433 Front Ecol Evol 9.
- 10  
11 434 Landsman AP, Burghardt KT, Bowman JL (2020) Invasive Grass (*Microstegium Vimineum*)  
12  
13  
14 435 Indirectly Benefits Spider Community by Subsidizing Available Prey. Ecol Evol  
15  
16 436 10:11133–11143.
- 17  
18  
19 437 Lehtinen RM, Hartman H, Marlowe B, Rojas A (2022) Evidence for Negative Impacts on  
20  
21 438 Terrestrial Salamanders following Invasive Plant Removal. J Herpetol 56:92–98.
- 22  
23  
24 439 Lenth RV (2016) Least-squares means: The R Package lsmeans. J Stat Softw 69:1–33.
- 25  
26 440 Lieurance D, Cipollini D (2013) Exotic *Lonicera* Species Both Escape and Resist Specialist And  
27  
28  
29 441 Generalist Herbivores In The Introduced Range In North America. Biol Invasions  
30  
31 442 15:1713–1724.
- 32  
33  
34 443 Lind EM, Parker JD (2010) Novel Weapons Testing: Are Invasive Plants More Chemically  
35  
36 444 Defended than Native Plants? PLOS ONE 5:e10429.
- 37  
38  
39 445 McCary MA, Mores R, Farfan MA, Wise DH (2016) Invasive Plants Have Different Effects on  
40  
41 446 Trophic Structure Of Green And Brown Food Webs In Terrestrial Ecosystems: A Meta-  
42  
43 447 Analysis. Ecol Lett 19:328–335.
- 44  
45  
46 448 McDonald P, Edwards RA, Greenhalgh JFD, Morgan CA, Sinclair LA, Wilkinson RG (2011)  
47  
48 449 Animal Nutrition, 7th edn. Pearson, Harlow, UK.
- 49  
50  
51 450 Midway S, Robertson M, Flinn S, Kaller M (2020) Comparing Multiple Comparisons: Practical  
52  
53 451 Guidance for Choosing the Best Multiple Comparisons Test. PeerJ 8:e10387.
- 54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

- 1  
2  
3  
4 452 Mosher ES, Silander JA, Latimer AM (2009) The Role of Land-Use History In Major Invasions  
5  
6  
7 453 By Woody Plant Species In The Northeastern North American Landscape. Biol Invasions  
8  
9 454 11:2317.
- 10  
11  
12 455 Narango DL, Tallamy DW, Marra PP (2018) Nonnative Plants Reduce Population Growth of An  
13  
14 456 Insectivorous Bird. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 115:11549–11554.
- 15  
16  
17 457 Pearson DE (2009) Invasive Plant Architecture Alters Trophic Interactions By Changing  
18  
19 458 Predator Abundance And Behavior. Oecologia 159:549–558.
- 20  
21  
22 459 Pimentel D, Pimentel M, Wilson A (2007) Plant, Animal, and Microbe Invasive Species in the  
23  
24 460 United States and World. In: Nentwig W (ed) Biological Invasions. Springer, Berlin,  
25  
26 461 Heidelberg, pp 315–330.
- 27  
28  
29 462 R Development Core Team (2022) *R version 4.1.2. R: A language and environment for*  
30  
31 463 *statistical computing*. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria.
- 32  
33  
34 464 Rai RK, Shrestha L, Joshi S, Clements DR (2022) Biotic and Economic Impacts of Plant  
35  
36 465 Invasions. In: Clements DR, Upadhyaya MK, Joshi S, Shrestha A (eds) Global Plant  
37  
38 466 Invasions. Springer International Publishing, Cham, pp 301–315.
- 39  
40  
41 467 Razeng E, Watson DM (2015) Nutritional Composition of The Preferred Prey Of Insectivorous  
42  
43 468 Birds: Popularity Reflects Quality. J Avian Biol 46:89–96.
- 44  
45  
46 469 Reeves JT, Fuhlendorf SD, Davis CA, Wilder SM (2021) Arthropod Prey Vary Among Orders in  
47  
48 470 Their Nutrient and Exoskeleton Content. Ecol Evol 11:17774–17785.
- 49  
50  
51 471 Ricciardi A, Iacarella JC, Aldridge DC, Blackburn TM, Carlton JT, Catford JA, Dick JTA,  
52  
53 472 Hulme PE, Jeschke JM, Liebhold AM, Lockwood JL, MacIsaac HJ, Meyerson LA, Pyšek  
54  
55 473 P, Richardson DM, Ruiz GM, Simberloff D, Vilà M, Wardle DA (2021) Four Priority  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

Areas to Advance Invasion Science In The Face Of Rapid Environmental Change.  
 Environ Rev 29:119–141.

Richard M, Tallamy DW, Mitchell AB (2019) Introduced Plants Reduce Species Interactions.  
 Biol Invasions 21:983–992.

Riedl HL, Stinson L, Pejchar L, Clements WH (2018) An Introduced Plant Affects Aquatic-  
 Derived Carbon in The Diets Of Riparian Birds. PLOS ONE 13:e0207389.

Robichaud CD, Basso JV, Rooney RC (2022) Control of Invasive *Phragmites australis*  
 (European Common Reed) Alters Macroinvertebrate Communities. Restor Ecol  
 30:e13548.

Robison AL, Berta JL, Mott CL, Register KJ (2021) Impacts of Invasive Amur Honeysuckle,  
*Lonicera Maackii*, Leaf Litter On Multiple Trophic Levels Of Detritus- Based  
 Experimental Wetlands. Freshw Biol 66:1464–1474.

Robbins CT, Felicetti LA, Sponheimer M (2005) The Effect of Dietary Protein Quality on  
 Nitrogen Isotope Discrimination In Mammals And Birds. Oecologia 144:534–540.

Schlaepfer MA (2018) Do non-native species contribute to biodiversity? PLOS Biol  
 16:e2005568.

Schneider SC, Miller JR (2014) Response of Avian Communities to Invasive Vegetation in  
 Urban Forest Fragments. The Condor 116:459–471.

Seebens H, Blackburn TM, Dyer EE, Genovesi P, Hulme PE, Jeschke JM, Pagad S, Pyšek P, M  
 Winter M, Arianoutsou M, Bacher S, Blasius B, Brundu G, Capinha C, Celesti-Grapow  
 L, Dawson W, Dullinger S, Fuentes N, Jäger H, Kartesz J, Kenis M, Kreft H, Kühn I,  
 Lenzner B, Liebhold A, Mosena A, Moser D, Nishino M, Pearman D, Pergl J, Rabitsch  
 W, Rojas-Sandoval J, Roques A, Rorke S, Rossinelli S, Roy HE, Scalera R, Schindler S,

- Štajerová K, Tokarska-Guzik B, van Kleunen M, Walker K, Weigelt P, Yamanaka T, Essl F (2017) No Saturation in The Accumulation Of Alien Species Worldwide. *Nat Commun* 8:14435.
- Shackleton RT, Vimercati G, Probert AF, Bacher S, Kull CA, Novoa A (2022) Consensus and Controversy in the Discipline of Invasion Science. *Conserv Biol* 36:e13931.
- Shields J, Saunders M, Gibson K, Zollner P, Dunning J, Jenkins M (2015) Short-Term Response of Native Flora to the Removal of Non-Native Shrubs in Mixed-Hardwood Forests of Indiana, USA. *Forests* 6:1878–1896.
- Singer MS, Farkas TE, Skorik CM., Mooney KA (2012) Tritrophic Interactions at A Community Level: Effects Of Host Plant Species Quality On Bird Predation Of Caterpillars. *Am Nat* 179:363–374.
- Smets R, Claes J, Van Der Borcht M (2021) On the Nitrogen Content and a Robust Nitrogen-To-Protein Conversion Factor Of Black Soldier Fly Larvae (*Hermetia illucens*). *Anal Bioanal Chem* 413:6365–6377.
- Tallamy DW, Narango DL, Mitchell AB (2021) Do Non-Native Plants Contribute to Insect Declines? *Ecol Entomol* 46:729–742.
- Tarr MD (2022) Effects of Non-native Shrubs on Caterpillars and Shrubland-Dependent Passerines Within Three Transmission Line Rights-of-Way in Southeastern New Hampshire. *Northeast Nat* 29:1–43.
- Traylor C, Ulyshen M, Wallace D, Loudermilk L, Ross C, Hawley C, Atchison RA, Williams JL, McHugh J (2022) Compositional Attributes of Invaded Forests Drive the Diversity of Insect Functional Groups. *Glob Ecol Conserv* 35:e02092.

- Wagner DL (2005) Caterpillars of Eastern North America: A Guide to Identification and Natural History, 1st edn. Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J.
- Wagner DL, Grames EM, Forister ML, Berenbaum MR, Stopak D (2021) Insect Decline in The Anthropocene: Death by A Thousand Cuts. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 118:e2023989118.
- Wang W, Zhang C, Allen J, Li W, Boyer M, Segerson K, Silander J (2016) Analysis and Prediction of Land Use Changes Related to Invasive Species and Major Driving Forces in the State of Connecticut. *Land* 5:25.
- Weidlich EWA, Flórido FG, Sorrini TB, Brancalion PHS (2020) Controlling Invasive Plant Species in Ecological Restoration: A Global Review. *J Appl Ecol* 57:1806–1817.
- Westman WE (1990) Park Management of Exotic Plant Species: Problems and Issues. *Conserv Biol* 4:251–260.
- Wootton JT (1997) Estimates and Tests of Per Capita Interaction Strength: Diet, Abundance, and Impact of Intertidally Foraging Birds. *Ecol Monogr* 67:45–64.
- Zavaleta ES, Hobbs RJ, Mooney HA (2001) Viewing Invasive Species Removal in a Whole-Ecosystem Context. *Trends Ecol Evol* 16:454–459.

1  
2  
3  
4 537 Statements and Declarations:  
5  
6

7 538  
8  
9 539 Funding: Funding for this research was provided by Great Hollow Nature Preserve & Ecological  
10  
11 540 Research Center.  
12  
13


14 541  
15  
16 542 Acknowledgements:  
17

18  
19 543 The bird exclusion experiment and taxonomic identification of insects were completed by three  
20  
21 544 dedicated and talented summer technicians at Great Hollow: Max Kirsch, Chris Tait, and Joan  
22  
23 545 Tremblay. Volunteers Joe McLaughlin, Ethan Mackenzi, and Alexa Dattner provided valued  
24  
25 546 support for fieldwork in 2021. Helen Poulos and Paul Kraut provided help on elemental analysis  
26  
27 547 in 2022. We thank Tim Farkas and Ian Cranston for advice on statistical analyses and data  
28  
29 548 manipulation over the course of this project.  
30  
31  
32



33 549  
34  
35  
36 550 Competing interests: The authors have no conflicts of interest to declare.  
37

38 551  
39  
40 552 Author contributions: RC, WC, CS completed fieldwork. TK completed elemental analysis. RC  
41  
42 553 completed data analysis. All authors wrote and revised the manuscript.  
43  
44  
45

46 554  
47  
48 555 Data availability statement: All data and R Code for this manuscript are available through Open  
49  
50 556 Science Framework (osf.io) at DOI 10.17605/OSF.IO/BVFNA.  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65



Click here to access/download  
**Supplementary Material**  
ESM\_1.pdf



Drs. Daniel Simberloff and Laura Meyerson  
Editors-in-Chief  
*Biological Invasions*

Dr. Robert Clark & Dr. Chad Seewagen  
Great Hollow Nature Preserve  
& Ecological Research Center  
225 State Route 37  
New Fairfield, CT 06812

Dear Drs. Daniel Simberloff and Laura Meyerson,

We are submitting our manuscript titled “Are native plants always better for wildlife than invasives? Insights from a community-level bird-exclusion experiment” for consideration as an Article in *Biological Invasions*. Non-native woody plants represent one of the most challenging issues in habitat restoration, with significant resources expended on control these invasives to improve outcomes for wildlife. Our submission fits with other recent articles reevaluating longstanding assumptions in invasive plant management in *Biological Invasions* like Schuster et al. 2023, “No evidence of a long-lived seedbank in a common buckthorn, *Rhamnus cathartica* L., within Minnesota deciduous forests”.

As scientists involved in songbird habitat improvement projects, we noticed a significant gap in the assumptions underlying invasive plant management in forests of the northeastern US. While there is ample evidence that invasive plants provide lower food resources to birds compared to native plants, does the comparison still hold in all management scenarios? To this end, we employed a predator exclusion experiment comparing bird predation effects across four non-native shrubs and locally abundant native trees and shrubs in the same habitat. This realistic comparison emulates the conditions in which local land trusts are pursuing invasive species control programs. To our surprise, native trees and shrubs experienced similar rates of bird predation effects. Variation in the quantity and quality of arthropod prey of invasives encompassed the range of values seen on natives. In other words, some invasive plants were worse than nearby native plants, but others were not.

We believe this result to be incredibly important for habitat improvement since it suggests that invasive plant removal could be detrimental in habitats where a dominant invasive plant species may not be poorer foraging opportunities for songbirds. Conversely, for low-quality invasive plants, removal would be suggested in habitats where native plants are higher quality. This more nuanced understanding of invasive plant management is important to our region, but also could inspire a similar perspective in other systems. We therefore believe the results reported in this manuscript will be engaging for the readership of *Biological Invasions*.

Sincerely,  
Robert Clark &  
Chad Seewagen  
[Robert.e.clark@wsu.edu](mailto:Robert.e.clark@wsu.edu)