Important notes from Rob:

*King and Tschinkel, 2008, our model PNAS paper is 3,500 words. Keep it short and to the point.*

Title(s):

Not all non-native shrubs provide equally poor food resources to insectivorous songbirds

Abstract:

Biological invasions threaten biodiversity by outcompeting native species and disrupting food webs. Invasive species are highly ranked as causal agents in the decline of endemic populations. Non-native woody plants now occupy nearly every conceivable habitat in terrestrial ecosystems as a result of human activity, either through intentional or unintentional introduction. Removal of invasive shrubs to improve habitats costs conservation organizations xxx million dollars a year. In eastern North American temperate forests, understory plant communities are now dominated by exotic species, in many cases being more numerous that native plants. As the base of forest food chains, it stands to reason that wildlife would be significantly and negatively impacted by the prevalence of invasive plants. For many species of insectivorous birds and mammals, invasive plants threaten populations by provided less food resources and food resources of lower quality. From the plant-insect interaction literature there are several mechanisms proposed: first, invasive plants have lower densities of herbivores compared to native congeners. Second, invasive plants have lower nutritional quality, so herbivores that do feed on them have lower nutrient density. Third, invasive plants have traits not seen in native habitats, such as distinctive architecture, and this provides microhabitat for insects resulting in highly modified insect community composition. As such, it is predicted that wildlife, like migratory insectivorous songbirds, will face significant challenges in meeting nutritional needs in habitats dominated by invasive shrubs. In this project, we tested the hypothesis that food availability and food quality for insectivorous songbirds is lower on inside woody plants compared to native woody plants in the same habitat. Using a wide range of host-plant species, including 6 native species and 4 invasive species, we quantified the prey being taken by birds, arthropod abundance and biomass, and the nutritional content of herbivores and spiders. All three lines of evidence contracted predictions – bird predatory effects were of similar strength on native and non-native plants, arthropod biomass was not significantly lower on invasives, and the N content of insect herbivores on invasives were higher than native plants. These results do not suggest a more nuanced approach to prioritizing removal of invasive shrubs that does not assume all invasive shrubs are equally harmful to wildlife in terms of food availability.
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Introduction:

*P1 – The impacts of invasive plants and cost of removal*

Invasive species are the leading cause of biodiversity decline globally, and to address this challenge over xx billion dollars is spent every year to manage invasive populations. Removal of invasive species is costly, but it can also be a highly effective way to conserve endangered species or maintain ecosystem services (See Dukes and Mooney 2004 and Charles and Dukes 2007 from GPI book chapter 8). Invasive plants are particularly challenging to manage in terrestrial ecosystems, with $100 billion dollars spent per year in the United States on management and mitigation (Chapter 8 from Global Plant Invasions or GPI). These management decisions are based on the goals of resource management, whether it’s facilitating the growth of native trees for forestry, improving habitat for native wildlife (some southwestern stuff), or preserving habitat for endangered species (phragmites stuff I think, see Lavergne et al. 2010b in GPI#8), or even reducing disease risk for humans (tick + barberry stuff). However, there are case studies in which invasive plants do not have as negative impacts on environments as other invasive species. Consequently, effective management should prioritize invasive species that (a) are most damaging and (b) contribute to the management goals. However, despite the importance of invasive plant management, comprehensive data on how to prioritize invasive plant removal is lacking.

*P2 – Negative impacts on wildlife as a case study in invasive plant biology*

Plant invasions have cascading impacts on all higher trophic levels by altering above-ground and below-ground food webs. Changes to food chains as a result of plant invasions has been documented in nearly every terrestrial ecosystem, and it is particularly prevalent in habitats experience frequent anthropogenic disturbance (meta-analysis citations). To ameliorate these negative impacts, invasive plant removal if a central feature of habitat improvement plans. In some systems, removal of invasive plants has promoted healthy wildlife populations and facilitate the recovery of declining species (find case studies). In many cases, invasive plant removal plans suggest removal of all non-native woody species. Frequently non-native co-occur and have overlapping impact areas (citation on co-occurring invasives). Understanding the impacts of non-natives on wildlife is an important goal as new invasive plant species are expected to accumulate (Seebens et al. 2017 citation from chapter 8 of GPI).

*P3 – Motivations for invasive plant management and the implicit assumptions about lower food quality in habitat restoration efforts*

The mechanisms by which invasive plants disrupt forest food webs has been well documented, but broad patterns still differ among host species. Typically, invasive plants are lower quality food sources for insect herbivores compared to native conspecifics (there are a million citations on this, a few from stuff like Norway maple would be ideal). As a result of lower nutritional quality, these invasive plants can host dramatically lower herbivore abundance and fewer species of herbivores. In cases where invasive plants have displaced natives, prey availability for insectivorous birds and mammals are significantly reduced. However, nutritional quality for herbivores is just one of multiple traits of invasive plants that impacts food webs. Allelopathic compounds released from invasive plants through roots and decaying leaves can impact soil food webs and insect prey. Furthermore, invasive plants have atypical architecture compared to native plants (spider paper citations), leading to different compositions of arthropods independent of the host plant quality (more of the spider paper citations).

Really good quote from Wagner et al. PNAS paper:

*One way that researchers have dealt with the complexity of population-level stochasticity in insects is to aggregate data at higher taxonomic levels: For example, using total insect biomass as a proxy for biodiversity, or aggregating data across different sites. Studies that generalize across datasets, higher taxonomic categories, or ecological groups (e.g., refs. 17, 18, 51, and 52) provide much-needed perspectives relevant to ecological function as, for example, the amount of insect food available to nestlings (53) and other insectivores or the general health of a region’s pollinators.*

*P4 – Hypotheses and predictions (this paragraph is not in other PNAS papers, but its important to me to use it as a narrative tool)*

At the community level, non-native plants are expected to have significantly lower prey available for insectivores compared to native plants in the same environment. Furthermore, the insect prey found on non-native plants expected to have lower nutritional quality for these insectivores as well (citation on N content of bugs on invasives). Due to lower abundance and quality of prey, it is generally anticipated that vertebrate insectivores will make optimal foraging decisions and invest less effort into finding food on invasives. As a consequence, the predatory effects of these insectivores should be weaker overall on non-natives vs. native plants. In our system, we tested these three paired hypotheses & predictions. First, that in a shared habitat a group of native woody plant species should have more insect prey than non-native woody species. Second, predation effects will be weaker on native vs non-natives plants overall in the same habitat where insectivore habitats overlap. Third, the nutritional quality of herbivores and other arthropods should be lower on natives vs. natives within these same managed habitats as well.

Methods:

*In PNAS Methods are presented at the end. To save space some methods are put into the supporting information documents*

Results:

P6 – Arthropod biomass across the ten species and bird treatments

P7 – community composition reporting what taxonomic groups birds are removing from native and non-native plants

P8 – Nutritional quality data (again, only 2 paragraphs in King and Tschinkel, 2008)

Discussion:

P9 – *Recapping results in a big picture way*

Our results validate the overwhelming evidence that invasive plants disrupt food webs in managed ecosystems (key trophic invasive plant papers). We observed major ecological differences in the composition of arthropod communities among native and non-native plants. The structure of arthropod food webs were distinctly different than those seen on native plants. However, our results also contradict work arguing that non-native plants provide little or no food resources to migratory songbirds. This is troubling since invasive plant removal is the leading focus of habitat improvement, costing government and non-profit organizations millions of dollars a year. With respect for nutritional quality of arthropod prey on invasive plants, our results suggest that a more nuanced management strategy be in place that prioritizes removal of invasive plants that are exceptionally poor foraging opportunities for songbirds. In some cases, there are clearly invasive plants that are not significantly worse in terms of abundance or nitrogen availability, and it would be up to the stakeholders to decide if it is still worth investing significant resources to remove such species.

P10 – Linking *it to past work on arthropod food webs and invasive plants*

Two primary mechanistic hypotheses have been tested with respect to invasive plants and their impacts on above-ground food webs. First, the nutritional quality of these plants is considered lower due to reduced nitrogen content (nutritional quality citations) and contextually higher defenses (non-co-evolved defenses citations) compared to native plants. Consequently, herbivores are less abundant, making the base of arthropod food webs less robust (rephrase later). Second, the architecture is often unique, providing a different microhabitat for arthropods and thus creating a distinct community compared to native plants (citations from spider work). While our study does not distinguish between either of these mechanisms nor tests these hypotheses directly, their predictions help explain several of the patterns we observed. Fitting with observations on other woody invasive plants, we observed higher spider abundance on our invasive plants. Likely differences in twig and leaf architecture provide superior scaffolding and hunting territory (citations from spider behavior). Interestingly, bird predation effects were still of a similar magnitude compared to natives, suggesting that spiders do not achieve enemy free space from insectivorous songbirds (e.g. enemy free space papers). Conversely, herbivores like caterpillars (Lepidoptera) were less abundant on invasive plants, likely owing to their inferior nutritional quality, but other mechanisms, such as increased threat from spider predation may also be important. Equivalent abundances of another major herbivore functional group, the Orthoptera, suggest that mobile grazing generalists may not be as constrained by the lower nutritional quality of invasive plants as they can forage on both types of hosts.

P11 – *Linking it to bird nutritional ecology done by other people in the region*

Despite the differences in arthropod community composition among native and non-natives hosts, we were surprised to see similar rates of bird predation effects on arthropod biomass. It stands to reason that insectivorous songbirds actively forage on and take prey from invasive plants, and there was no evidence that these predators take less biomass from invasive species.

P12 – *Take it home: broader implications and future work needed*

Methods:

P13 – Site information

We performed a selective predator exclusion treatment on ten woody host plant species at Great Hollow Nature Preserve & Ecological Research center (Fairfield Co., Connecticut, USA). This 834-hectare forest preserve follows a USDA forestry conservation plan aimed at managing for outdoor recreation and wildlife habitat. We intentionally chose locations that would typically be targeted for invasive shrub removal, with a dense understory including Japanese barberry (*Berberis thunbergia)*, Honeysuckle, *Lonicerna* spp. (primarily *Lonicera mackii*), Burning bush (*Eunonymous alatus*), and Autumn olive (*Eleagnus umbellata*). Native understory shrubs and understory trees included Striped maple *Acer pennsylvanicum*, Shadbush (*Amelanchier canadensis*), Musclewood (*Carpinus caroliniana*), and Witch-hazel (*Hamamelis virginiana*). Our experiment occurred in areas where the overstory tree composition is dominated by Sweet birch (*Betula lenta*) and American beech (*Fagus grandifolia*). As these ten species were the dominant woody plants in the selected habitat, we performed experiments on all to provide a community-wide perspective on the impacts of invasive plants on food webs compared to native woody plants.

P14 – Predation manipulation

From May 4th to May 27th, 2021, we employed a predator exclusion experiment in a paired design (following Singer et al. 2012). Insectivorous birds were prevented from foraging on branches *via* a mesh netting that was draped over branches and affixed to the base of the branch using Velcro (“- birds”). Each of these branches were paired with a nearby (< 10m) unmanipulated control branch (“+ birds”). We set up treatments on 12 pairs for each of ten focal woody plant species, consequently a total of 240 plants were sampled this way. At the end of the set up period after May 27th branches were gently tapped to dislodge arthropods so the sampling occurring exactly 2 weeks later was measured from the same exact starting point. Afterwards, each of these 240 plants were sampled three times in the same order and with the same time duration (in days) between set up and sampling. These three repeated sampled brought the number of arthropod community samples up to 720 (sampling methods following Clark et al 2016). Arthropod abundance was quantified by collecting all foliage-foraging invertebrates using branch-beating (branch beating citation). Each branch was struck with a 0.3m dowel while hanging over a 1m2 ripstop fabric beat sheet. All invertebrates that landed on the sheet were collected via aspirators or soft-touch aluminum forceps.

P14 – arthropod id and processing

All invertebrates collected in the field were transferred immediately to 7 × 3cm plastic vials or 16 × 8cm plastic zip-top bags and preserved in a –18° C lab freezer. Afterwards, specimens collected on entire experimental branches were weighed (wet mass) on a 10^-4 g microbalance. All invertebrates were identified to class. Common arthropod species (those observed > 25 times) were then identified to order, and all insects in the orders Lepidoptera, Hemiptera, Hymenoptera were identified to family. True spiders (Araneae) and Opiliones were identified to family as well. All invertebrate sorting and taxonomic identification was completed from June 2021 to August 2021. Once identifications were complete, all taxonomic groups from each individual branch sample and placed into 0.6mL and 2mL Eppendorf tubes kept in the lab freezer for later processing.

P15 – nutritional quality methods

Our preliminary analyses suggested that two broad functional groups responded strongly to bird predation effects and varied significantly among native and non-native host plants. Foliage-feeding herbivores included the three most common insect orders collected in our experiment: Hemiptera (True bugs not including predatory true bugs), Orthoptera, and Lepidoptera. Several families of known insect herbivores were included in this method (see Appendix 1) in order to assure a complete picture of the nutritional quality of insect herbivore likely to be eaten by insectivores. Spiders (Araneae) were among the most abundant arthropod orders and are known to be important prey for insectivorous, migratory songbirds (birds eating spidahs citation). These two groupings of arthropod samples were assayed for percent nitrogen content as a proxy for nutritional quality for insectivores (i.e. relative protein content). [Can you guys write up the technical details of the C:N methods?]

P16 – stats methods 1

We employed a series of Generalized Linear Mixed Models (GLMMs) using the lme4 package (citation) in R version 4.1.2 (citation). These univariate analyses use the following as response variables: (1) total arthropod biomass sampled per plant in grams, (2) spider abundance (Araneae), (3) caterpillar abundance (Lepidoptera), (4) Hemiptera abundance, and (5) aquatic insect abundance (Stoneflies and Mayflies), (6) C:N Content of spiders, and (7) C:N content of putative herbivores. Arthropod biomass (1) was fitted as normally distributed variable after a log-transformation. All abundance models were fitted using the negative binomial distribution (citations). C:N ratio models were fit using the xxx distribution (or this fitted as % mass that is N). Related to these GLMM’s, we performed a set of diagnostic tests to determine the impact of leaf counts on arthropod biomass among host-plant species (Appendix 1). Posthoc tests comparing changes in biomass, spider abundance, true bug abundance, caterpillar abundance, and tree cricket & katydid abundance were run using the emmeans package in R (Lenth 2009). Differences were investigated across all groupings using Scheffe’s method (following Midway et al. 2020) for P-value adjustment in unplanned contrasts.

P16 – stats methods 2 **[overflow for field methods information or C:N ratio analyses. We probably want more about the experimental design and location, maybe each in their own paragraph]**

P18 – **(K&T had 6 short methods paragraphs, but I don’t think we need that much, save the space for the intro or results)**

Fig. 1a. & 1b.
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Figure 2a & 2b & 2c & 2d
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Figure 4: (Not table like in K&T)

Nutritional quality plot (C:N ratio), this should only be a clustered bar chart with the 2 groups among the 10 species if possible.

Supporting information:

GLMM table 1

GLMM table 2

GLMM table 3

Variation in insect abundance among native and non-native plants plots from seminars