



UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS

This is a repository copy of *Impacts of a biocontrol agent on invasive Ageratina adenophora in Southwest China: Friend or foe?*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:
<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/168485/>

Version: Accepted Version

Article:

Yuan, C, Wang, Q, Chen, Y et al. (7 more authors) (2021) Impacts of a biocontrol agent on invasive *Ageratina adenophora* in Southwest China: Friend or foe? *Biological Control*, 152. 104471. ISSN 1049-9644

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocontrol.2020.104471>

© 2020, Elsevier Inc. This manuscript version is made available under the CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 license <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>.

Reuse

This article is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs (CC BY-NC-ND) licence. This licence only allows you to download this work and share it with others as long as you credit the authors, but you can't change the article in any way or use it commercially. More information and the full terms of the licence here: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/>

Takedown

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.



eprints@whiterose.ac.uk
<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/>

1 **Impacts of a biocontrol agent on invasive *Ageratina adenophora* in Southwest**
2 **China: Friend or foe?**

3 Chuan Yuan^a, Qin Wang^a, Yan Chen^{a*}, Li-Dan Zhang^{a, b}, Lu Tan^{a, c}, Rong-Hua Fu^a,
4 Jin-Tian Yang^a, Yan Li^a, Mei Liu^a, Stephen G. Compton^{d, e}

5
6 a. Ecological Security and Protection Key laboratory of Sichuan Province, Mianyang
7 Normal University, Mianyang, Sichuan 621000, China

8 b. Southwest University No.3 Experimental School, Guangyuan, Sichuan 636600,
9 China

10 c. Triticeae Research Institute, Sichuan Agricultural University, Wenjiang, Chengdu,
11 Sichuan 611130, China

12 d. School of Biology, University of Leeds, Leeds LS2 9JT, United Kingdom

13 e. Department of Zoology and Entomology, Rhodes University, Grahamstown 6140,
14 South Africa

15

16 *Author for correspondence:

17 Yan Chen

18 Ecological Security and Protection Key Laboratory of Sichuan Province,

19 Mianyang Normal University

20 Mianyang, Sichuan 621000

21 China

22 Email: goose_01@163.com

23

1 **Abstract**

2 Classical biological control of invasive plants depends on the introduction of host-
3 specific natural enemies. Many natural enemies have provided successful control, but
4 the impacts of herbivorous insects on their hosts are highly variable and context
5 dependent. Under some circumstances, overcompensation can even occur, with plant
6 reproduction temporarily increasing rather than decreasing in response to herbivory.
7 The stem-galling fly *Procecidochares utilis* has been widely introduced to help
8 control *Ageratina adenophora*, a globally significant weed, but its impact has been
9 inconsistent and in places ineffective. Its galling is known to stimulate production of
10 side branches in plants under laboratory conditions. We examined the abundance and
11 impact of *P. utilis* at four *A. adenophora* sites of Southwest China that were invaded
12 at different times and support different densities of the insect. Stems with galls were
13 more likely to be branched and produced more capitula. Furthermore, seed numbers in
14 capitula from galled and un-galled stems were similar, and galling resulted in only
15 slightly reduced seed weights. However, the increase in above-ground vegetative
16 biomass associated with branching resulted in less efficient capitulum production
17 relative to vegetative growth. Clearly *Procecidochares utilis* is not providing effective
18 biocontrol of *Ageratina adenophora* in Southwest China so far. In the long term,
19 galled plants may display reduced competitive ability and lower lifetime reproductive
20 success, but the short term increases in seed production it generates suggest it may be
21 favouring its host's range expansion. The fly has been a successful biocontrol agent in
22 dry area of Hawaii, so understanding the factors that determine its effectiveness
23 represent a major challenge for the future.

24

25 **Keywords:** apical dominance; galls; invasive Asteraceae; over-compensation;
26 *Procecidochares utilis*; Tephritidae.

27

1 **1. Introduction**

2 Invasive species represent an increasing threat to natural and managed
3 ecosystems (Fournier et al., 2019; Pearson et al., 2018; Pyšek et al., 2012; Simberloff
4 et al., 2013). Once they become abundant, transformative non-native plant species can
5 reduce biodiversity (Bellard et al., 2016; Butchart et al., 2010; Rands et al., 2010;
6 Wilcove et al., 1998) and have a serious impact on ecological processes and
7 ecosystem services (Pejchar and Mooney, 2009; Vilà et al., 2011). They can also
8 generate significant socio-economic and management costs (Bradshaw et al., 2016).
9 Classical biological control can produce long term, effective and ecologically safe
10 results (Messing and Wright, 2006; Shea and Possingham, 2000), but the results are
11 less predictable than with physical or chemical methods (Van Wilgen et al., 2013).

12 The consequences of herbivory for individual plants and for the demographics of
13 plant populations are highly variable and context dependent. They vary, for example,
14 with the extent of competition with other plants, the densities of herbivores and the
15 timing and duration of their feeding (Crawley, 1983; Reese et al., 2016). Plants can
16 often survive even intense herbivory, especially if the duration of the damage is brief
17 (Myers and Sarfraz, 2017). Plant responses to herbivory have been categorized in
18 terms of their capacity for resistance, tolerance or phenological escape (Agrawal,
19 2000; Gong and Zhang, 2014; Rosenthal and Kotanen, 1994). Their ability for
20 compensatory growth can mean that herbivory has no detectable impact on
21 subsequent reproductive success, at least in the short term (Garcia and Eubanks, 2019;
22 Rosenthal and Kotanen, 1994). One unusual compensatory response is
23 overcompensation, where vegetative growth and/or sexual reproduction increases
24 temporarily in response to herbivory (Agrawal, 2000; McNaughton, 1979). Early
25 evidence for overcompensation was based on plants under controlled conditions
26 (Belsky, 1986), where high resource availability and weak competition made
27 overcompensation easier to detect (Garcia and Eubanks, 2019). However, recent
28 studies have demonstrated that overcompensation can also occur in natural systems
29 (Ramula et al., 2019).

30 Insect-induced overcompensation has obvious consequences for the chances of
31 success of biocontrol programmes that target invasive plants (Garcia and Eubanks,
32 2019). For example, two agents (*Neogalerucella californiensis* (L.) and *N. pusilla*
33 (Duft), Coleoptera) that were released to control invasive *Lythrum salicaria* L.
34 (Lythraceae) in North America generated increased numbers of flowers on the plants

1 they ate (Blossey and Schat, 1997; Russell-Mercier and Sargent, 2015; Thomsen and
2 Sargent, 2017). Overcompensation in terms of flower production among invasive
3 plants is likely to be achieved at the cost of reduced competitive ability and vegetative
4 growth, and have context-dependent consequences (Agrawal, 2000; Garcia and
5 Eubanks, 2019). Any increases in seed production, however temporary, would be
6 especially significant during earlier phases of invasion, when the plants are still
7 extending their ranges and seed production is particularly significant for recruitment
8 (Ramula et al., 2019).

9 Crofton weed, *Ageratina adenophora* R. King & H. Robinson (Asteraceae)
10 (previously known as *Eupatorium adenophorum* Sprengel) is among the world's most
11 serious weeds (Heystek et al., 2011; Wan et al., 2010). Its native distribution covers
12 Mexico and Costa Rica in Central America, from where it has been spread to over 30
13 tropical and subtropical countries. In non-native areas it is an ecological hazard and
14 can also cause serious economic losses to forestry and agriculture (Heystek et al.,
15 2011; Wan et al., 2010). The plant has been introduced to Asia, where in the 1940s it
16 expanded into Yunnan Province, China from Burma (Myanmar). It is now distributed
17 throughout Southwest China, including Yunnan, Sichuan, Guizhou, Guangxi and
18 Xizang Provinces and the Chongqing region (Sun et al., 2004; Wan et al., 2010).

19 *Ageratina adenophora* is a perennial herb or subshrub with a life span of 12 to 15
20 years (Sun et al., 2004; Sun et al., 2005). The plant can reproduce through seeds and
21 also spreads vegetatively via rhizomes. In Southwest China, numerous terminal
22 capitula with white flowers are produced from the end of February, followed by seed
23 set in April and May. One individual can produce over 10,000 small seeds (Heystek et
24 al., 2011; Sang et al., 2010). They are mainly dispersed by the wind but can also be
25 transported by water (Heystek et al., 2011; Wan et al., 2010). Most seeds germinate in
26 the rainy season of the same year in which they are produced (Dang et al., 2008). The
27 ant *Dorylus orientalis* Westwood (Hymenoptera: Formicidae) has been recorded to
28 damage *A. adenophora* (along with a variety of crop species) in Southwest China, but
29 the plant does not routinely support any native phytophagous insects (Niu et al.,
30 2010). A fungal pathogen, *Alternaria alternata* (Fr.) Keissler was isolated from *A.*
31 *adenophora* in Southwest China which induced damage to the plant (Chen et al.,
32 2005; Qiang et al., 2006; Wan et al., 2001), however no effective control was
33 generated at the time (Wan et al., 2001). The leaf-spot fungal pathogen, *Passalora*

1 *ageratinae* Crous and A.R. Wood, an agent used for the control of the weed in South
2 Africa (Buccellato et al., 2012, 2019), has not been recorded from China.

3 *Procecidochares utilis* Stone (Diptera, Tephritidae) is a host-specific fly that
4 induces galls on both main stems and side branches of *A. adenophora*. Its galls act as
5 resource sinks that can reduce the vegetation growth and reproductive vigour of galled
6 plants (Bess and Haramoto, 1972; Erasmus et al., 1992; Van Staden and Bennett,
7 1991a, 1991b; Wang et al., 2006). It was introduced from its native Mexico to Hawaii
8 as a biocontrol agent and has subsequently been released in at least seven further
9 countries, where it has become widely established (Bess and Haramoto, 1972;
10 Heystek et al., 2011). Within this large area, the effectiveness of control by *P. utilis*
11 has been highly variable (Heystek et al., 2011; Sharma Poudel et al., 2020). This has
12 been attributed to the fly's inability to reach high densities in some areas, in part
13 because it can suffer from high rates of attack from parasitoids (Heystek et al., 2011;
14 Wan et al., 2010; Zhang et al., 2008). In Hawaii, *A. adenophora* populations in drier
15 locations were reduced or even eliminated by the fly, but it had little effect in areas
16 where precipitation was high (Bess and Haramoto, 1972). These differences in impact
17 reflect the plant's vegetative growth being inhibited in some places (Buccellato et al.,
18 2012; Erasmus et al., 1992) but not affected elsewhere (Wan et al., 2010). Similarly,
19 galling by the fly can reduce seed numbers per capitulum (Erasmus et al., 1992) or
20 have no effect (Wan et al., 2010). Seed vigour and germination rates may or may not
21 be depressed (Erasmus et al., 1992; Wan et al., 2010).

22 The ability of *P. utilis* to generate changes in its host plant's architecture may
23 contribute to the variability of its impact. Galling by the fly induces the production of
24 side branches, which can support additional capitula. This means that even if galling
25 initially has a negative impact on reproduction, compensatory growth of side branches
26 can result in increases in capitula production, though their size and quality can be
27 lower than that on gall-free plants (Buccellato et al., 2012; Erasmus et al., 1992). The
28 relative significance of vegetative growth and reproduction by seed varies between
29 sites. The impact of *P. utilis* on *A. adenophora* individuals can therefore potentially
30 range from negative, through neutral to even positive, depending on the densities of
31 the insect, the ecological context in which the plant and insect are interacting and the
32 timing of assessment of reproductive performance relative to when the insects gall the
33 plants.

1 Here, we examine the relationship between *A. adenophora* and *P. utilis* across an
2 invasion front in Southwest China to ascertain the insect's likely contribution towards
3 slowing the expansion of the plant. The specific questions we address are: (1) How
4 variable are *P. utilis* gall densities at four sites across its host's invasion front? And
5 (2) is the plant's reproductive output influenced by the insect?
6

7 **2. Materials and Methods:**

8 *2.1 Locations and sampling*

9 *Ageratina adenophora* is spreading northwards and eastwards by about 20 km
10 per year in China (Wan et al. 2010), with roads acting as important conduits for the
11 spread of the plant (Lu and Ma, 2006). Chinese National Road 108 runs south to north
12 across Sichuan Province, and the range of *Ageratina adenophora* is expanding from
13 the south along it. Four roadside sites were sampled, from Pingdi (PD) in the South to
14 Hangyuan (HY) about 500 km further north (Table 1). *A. adenophora* populations are
15 not continuous along the roadside, but the plant can reach high densities in areas
16 where they are present. The southern site at PD has had the plant established since at
17 least the 1980s (Yang et al., 1996) whereas the plant was first recorded at HY in 2002
18 (Luo et al., 2006). Our 2018 visual surveys from vehicles suggest that HY lies at the
19 current northern range extent of *A. adenophora* in Sichuan Province.

20 Individual plants of *A. adenophora* were hard to distinguish within dense
21 populations, because the rhizomatous spread of the plant allows individuals to occupy
22 areas up to more than one metre across, with several flowering stems. An area-based
23 sampling method was therefore employed. 50 plots of area 0.0625 m² (25cm x 25cm)
24 were sampled in a linear fashion within each of the four sites in April 2018. The plots
25 were spread along the roadside within each site, with the plots separated by at least 50
26 metres from each other. All *A. adenophora* plants in each plot were uprooted using a
27 garden fork and taken back to the laboratory for later examination. Main stems were
28 recognized on the basis of ascending from the ground, from each of which there were
29 often side branches.

30 The capitula within each plot were removed quickly to prevent the seeds from
31 escaping. The length of main stems and their associated side branches were measured
32 to the nearest 0.1cm with a ruler. Side branch lengths were summed for each main
33 stem. The numbers of *Procecidochares utilis* galls were recorded for each main stem.
34 Measurements of gall size were not made, but there was no apparent geographical

1 variation in this character. The branches (without capitula) with their leaves and galls
2 were dried for 48h at 65°C to constant weight. Above-ground dry biomass (i.e.
3 excluding roots) was then weighed using an electronic balance (Deching Baijie
4 Electric Co., Ltd., China).

5 Comparisons of seed numbers per capitulum were made using seeds from
6 capitula located on branches with or without galls, sampled from fourteen plots (1m x
7 1m) at sites HY and PD. These sites represented the most recent and longest-
8 established populations respectively. To avoid any plant architecture effects, only
9 capitula on larger side branches arising from the lower half of the main stems were
10 sampled. The collections were made in April 2017, when the seeds were just reaching
11 maturity, to prevent any chance of seed shedding. The presence of galls on each
12 branch was recorded, and two entire capitula were selected at random from each
13 galled and un-galled branch to count the seeds they contained.

14 Seed quality comparisons were based on samples taken in May 2019, by which
15 time the capitula contained mature seeds. Twelve to fifteen 1m² plots were sampled at
16 each of the four sites. Two branches, one with galls and another without, were
17 sampled for each plot. The seeds remaining in the capitula were removed from the
18 sampled branches and stored in silica gel to remove moisture before being weighed in
19 groups with an electronic balance (SHIMADZU, with measurements to 0.1mg).

21 2.2 Data analysis

22 Descriptive statistics included the proportion of plots with galls of *P. utilis* and
23 the densities of galls per stem, the numbers of stems, side branches and capitula
24 present, the numbers of seed per capitulum, the dry weights of the seeds and the
25 branches.

26 Between-site differences of gall densities, branch numbers, capitulum numbers,
27 gall numbers and vegetative growth, flower production among sampled sites were
28 tested using Generalized Linear Models (GLMs) with a quasi-Poisson distribution in
29 R 3.4.4 (R Development Core Team, 2013). Spearman correlations were also carried
30 out in R. The differences in the likelihood of stem branching between sampled sites
31 were assessed by Chi square tests of the frequencies of branched main stems in R.

32 To take into account our split-plot design, the relationship between type (galled
33 vs non-galled side branches) and seed mass was initially tested in R using a linear
34 mixed model, with gall presence and site as fixed effects and plot as a random effect.

1 However, as there was no effect of plot ($p=1$), this variable was removed, and the
2 effects of type and site tested in a linear model. Normality and homoscedasticity of
3 residuals were checked using Shapiro-Wilks test and Levene's test.

4 MetaWin 2.1 software (Rosenberg et al., 2000) was used to generate Hedge's d
5 statistics that assessed the extent of compensatory responses of *A. adenophora* to the
6 galling of *P. utilis* (Garcia and Eubanks, 2019). 95% confidence intervals for Hedge's
7 d were bootstrap-generated. The responses of individual stems were recorded in terms
8 of branch numbers and the branch lengths.

10 **3. Results**

11 *3.1 Ageratina adenophora vegetative growth and reproductive investment*

12 *Ageratina adenophora* was present at high densities, with an overall average of
13 more than 10 main stems per plot (equivalent to 160 stems m^{-2}) with above-ground
14 dry vegetative biomass of almost 200 g per plot (3.2 kg m^{-2}) (Table 2).

15 Plots that had a higher above-ground vegetative biomass had more main stems
16 and more side branches (Spearman correlations, plots from all sites combined, $\rho =$
17 0.393, $p < 0.001$ and $\rho = 0.651$, $p < 0.001$, respectively). The highest vegetative
18 biomass and density of plant stems were recorded at site PD, where the plant
19 population has been established longest (Table 2). However, stem densities and
20 vegetative biomass at site HY, where the plant has most recently become established,
21 were similar to those of the two intermediate sites (Table 2). Consequently, there was
22 no clear relationship between vegetative features and how recently the plant
23 populations had become established.

24 Capitulum densities were extremely high, especially at site PD, where they
25 reached over 2000 per plot (equivalent to 32000 capitula m^{-2} and over 200 capitula
26 per main stem) and around 12 capitula per gram of vegetative biomass. Capitulum
27 numbers in relation to vegetative biomass did not vary significantly between sites
28 (Table 2). Plots containing a higher vegetative biomass and more stems generally
29 contained more capitula, but there was some variation between sites (Supplementary
30 Table 1).

32 *3.2 Densities of Procecidochares utilis galls*

1 *Procecidochares utilis* galls were recorded in a majority of the *Ageratina*
2 *adenophora* plots at all four sites and were especially widespread at site PD, where
3 88% of the plots had galls present (Fig. 1). Within plots, the proportion of stems
4 supporting gall development ranged from 12-15% at three of the sites, but galling
5 rates were twice this at site PD (Fig. 1). The number of galls present on the main
6 stems and their associated branches ranged from zero to ten, but most galled stems
7 supported a single gall (312 out of 507 galled stems). The highest gall densities per
8 stem were at site PD, where there were significantly higher numbers of galls per plot,
9 per unit vegetative biomass, per main stem and per stems plus associated branches
10 than elsewhere (Supplementary Table 2). Other sites did not vary significantly in any
11 measures of gall abundance.

12 The relationships between the numbers of galls present in the plots and features
13 of their host plants are summarized in Table 3. Plots that contained a higher vegetative
14 biomass, more stems, and more stems plus their side branches, supported more galls.
15 The number of galls on individual stems was independent of the number of stems in
16 the plots at most of the sites (Spearman Correlations, $p > 0.05$), although a significant
17 negative relationship was present at site HY ($\rho = -0.300$, $p = 0.035$).

18 19 3.3 *The extent of branching*

20 The numbers of side branches present on individual main stems ranged from 0 to
21 29.

22 Overall, 41.5% of the main stems had side branches (N stems = 2369), but the
23 proportion of branched stems increased progressively from north to south, with about
24 30% of the stems branched at northern site HY and 60% branched at the southern site
25 PD (Fig. 2).

26 27 3.4 *The relationship between branching and capitulum numbers*

28 Overall, plots with more side branches supported the development of larger
29 numbers of capitula (with significant correlations also present at three of the four
30 individual sites) and plots where there were more side branches per main stem also
31 produced more capitula (with significant correlations at two of the four individual
32 sites) (Supplementary Table 1).

33 34 3.5 *The relationship between galls, branching and capitulum numbers*

1 Stems with galls averaged about twice as many side branches as stems that had
2 not been galled (Table 4). Stems with greater numbers of galls also had increasing
3 numbers of side branches (Supplementary Table 3). Site PD had a far higher
4 proportion of galled stems than the other sites (Fig. 1) and also had a higher
5 proportion of main stems that were branched (Fig. 2). At all four sites there was a
6 consistent positive relationship between the number of galls present on a stem and the
7 number of side branches (Table 5). The effects of *P. utilis* galling for each main stem
8 were assessed in the plot where galls were present. The galled stems had more side
9 branches (Supplementary Table 4). The plant responses to galling, as measured by
10 Hedge's *d*, are presented in Fig. 3. The values for Hedge's *d* are within the range
11 recorded for reproductive (0.8676 to 1.3294) and vegetative (0.9334 to 1.2359)
12 overcompensation by Garcia and Eubanks (2019).

13 Plots that included larger numbers of galls also contained more capitula, but
14 when capitulum numbers are compared relative to the amount of vegetative biomass
15 present, there was a negative relationship with gall abundance (Table 3). An
16 explanation for this is that as the numbers of galls increased, so did the extent of
17 branching. This led to the production of more capitula, but because of the extra
18 vegetative growth required to form the branches, the ratio of vegetative to
19 reproductive investment declined.

20

21 *3.6 Seed numbers and seed weights*

22 The numbers of seeds inside capitula collected from the large side branches were
23 recorded at sites HY and PD. In total, 3695 branches were sampled (111.97 ± 61.36
24 branches per plot, mean \pm SD). A total of 3050 side branches had no galls and 645
25 branches had *P. utilis* galls present. At both sites about 50 seeds were present in each
26 capitulum, with no differences in the numbers of seeds in capitula collected from
27 galled and un-galled branches (Table 6).

28 Seed weight was slightly higher overall in capitula obtained from stems that had
29 not been galled, but no difference was detected at three of the four individual sites.
30 The weights of the seeds differed much more strongly between sites ($F_{[3,109]} = 6.71$, P
31 $= 0.0003$). However, when the differences between each pair of populations were
32 tested, only site PD had lower weight (Table 6).

33

34 **4. Discussion**

1 We investigated the continuing expansion of *A. adenophora* populations
2 northwards along Chinese National Road 108 in Sichuan Province and the impact that
3 the gall-forming fly *P. utilis* may be having on this expansion. Seed production is
4 likely to be essential for the establishment of new populations of the plant, but this is
5 supplemented by vegetative spread leading to the establishment of the dense stands
6 that make the plant a significant economic and ecological problem. This densification
7 of existing stands was reflected in the higher stem densities and increased within-plot
8 vegetative biomass present in the southernmost population PD, where the plants have
9 been established longest. There were also higher densities of the gall-forming fly *P.*
10 *utilis* at this site and more branching of the stems than elsewhere.

11 Compensatory growth of *A. adenophora* in response to simulated herbivory (Zhu
12 and Sang, 2008) and insect galling (Buccellato et al., 2012; Erasmus et al., 1992) has
13 been explored previously under controlled conditions. Under our field conditions the
14 galled stems were more likely to branch than undamaged stems. *Procecidochares*
15 *utilis* lays eggs on the branch near the terminal vegetative bud, and groups of their
16 larvae burrow into the young stems where they induce galls (Bennett and Vanstaden,
17 1986). Increased branching is likely to reflect a relaxation of apical dominance
18 (Agrawal, 2000; Buccellato et al., 2019; Rosenthal and Kotanen, 1994) resulting from
19 high levels of cytokinins generated within the galls (Van Staden and Bennett, 1991b).

20 The increase in branching in response to galling by *P. utilis* resulted in the
21 production of more capitula, but capitula on galled stems were more costly for the
22 plants to produce because of the extra investment in vegetative biomass that was
23 required to produce the side branches. In terms of the energy budgets of the plants,
24 this suggests that galling resulted in a greater, but less efficient, commitment of
25 resources to reproduction and above-ground vegetative growth. The extent to which
26 this was reflected in changes in below-ground growth and energy stores is unknown.
27 The increase in reproductive investment generated by the galls, as well as the direct
28 energetic costs of supporting gall development (Van Staden and Bennett, 1991a),
29 suggests that the competitive abilities of the plants may be reduced by the flies.
30 However, this impact may be insignificant for inter-specific competition because of
31 the physiological characteristics of the invasive plants that make them particularly
32 vigorous. Photosynthetic rates and nutrient use-efficiencies of *A. adenophora* in
33 Chinese sites were higher than those of sympatric native species in China (Feng,
34 2008a, b; Lei et al., 2011; Zheng et al., 2012) and also higher than those recorded for

1 the plant in its native range (Feng et al., 2011; Lei et al., 2011; Wang et al., 2013).
2 The plant's prolonged growing season also allows a greater accumulation of
3 photosynthates than sympatric native species in China (Gao et al., 2013; Wang et al.,
4 2013) and in addition, a self-reinforcing mechanism has been found that favours
5 invasion by *A. adenophora*, because high densities of *A. adenophora* increase the
6 levels of available N, P and K in the soil (Wan et al., 2010).

7 Rates of seed production are particularly important for the dynamics of range
8 expansion by invading species (Tabassum and Leishman, 2018). In situations such as
9 those in Sichuan, where the distribution of the plant is spreading northwards, this
10 suggests that galling by the fly has the potential to speed the expansion of its host.
11 Any consequences of increased seed production are not likely to have been reduced
12 by negative effects of galling on the numbers of seeds in the capitula or their quality
13 because the former was unaffected by galling and there was only a minor reduction in
14 seed size. Additionally, germination rates in this species have been found to be
15 independent of seed weight (Datta et al., 2017) and the between-site variation in seed
16 weights we recorded was much greater than the impact of galling. Under controlled
17 conditions, lower rates of germination of seeds from heavily galled *A. adenophora*
18 have nonetheless been reported (Wan et al., 2010; Wang et al., 2006).

19 *Procecidochares utilis* has been introduced widely to control *A. adenophora*, but
20 its impact on the plant has been inconsistent (Heystek et al., 2011, Sharma Poudel et
21 al., 2020). In Hawaii, successful control was only achieved at sites where 50% or
22 more of the stems were galled and densities of galls on each stem were high (Bess and
23 Haramoto, 1972). Galling rates at our study populations were lower than this, only
24 reaching even 40% at the longest-established site. The lack of any negative impact of
25 *P. utilis* galling on the plant in Southwest China is therefore consistent with results
26 from elsewhere, but the likely benefits for the plants from the activity of the fly may
27 be exceptional. Transnational migration of biocontrol agents into areas where they
28 have not been deliberately introduced is often beneficial (Langa et al., 2020) but this
29 has not been the case with the arrival of *P. utilis* in China.

30

31 **5. The wider story – beyond our study species**

32 Over-compensation by plants in response to herbivory may be more frequent
33 than usually realized (Garcia and Eubanks, 2019). The responses of plants to
34 herbivory are dependent on ecological context (Wise and Abrahamson, 2005), and

1 models suggest that responses to herbivory are highly dependant on available
2 resources (Wise and Abrahamson, 2005). Increased photosynthetic rates, resource
3 uptake rates and nutrient transport rates, with more nutrients allocated into meristems
4 are features of regrowth after damage (Agrawal, 2000; Rosenthal and Kotanen, 1994;
5 Wise and Abrahamson, 2005). Compensatory responses to herbivory have been
6 recorded in many terrestrial plants (Agrawal, 2000; McNaughton, 1979), including
7 some invasive species (Liao et al., 2016), and may be almost ubiquitous. Our results
8 suggest that particular care is needed during assessment of the impact of candidate
9 biocontrol agents that alter the architecture of their hosts.

10 **Acknowledgements**

11 This study was supported by Sichuan Science and Technology Program
12 (2017JY0046), the Foundation of Ecological Security and Protection Key Laboratory
13 of Sichuan province (ESP 1501). We would like to express our appreciation to, Yu-
14 Qing Gong, Nan-Xi Chen for their help in data collection; Rupert Quinnell, Xing
15 Tong for their help in data analysis; Costas Zachariades for suggestions on
16 manuscript.

17

18 **References**

- 19 Agrawal, A.A., 2000. Overcompensation of plants in response to herbivory and the
20 by-product benefits of mutualism. *Trends Plant Sci.* 5, 309-313.
- 21 Bellard, C., Cassey, P., Blackburn, T.M., 2016. Alien species as a driver of recent
22 extinctions. *Biol. Lett.* 12, 20150623.
- 23 Belsky, A.J., 1986. Does herbivory benefit plants? A review of the evidence. *Am.*
24 *Nat.* 127, 870-892.
- 25 Blossey, B., Schat, M., 1997. Performance of *Galerucella californiensis* (Coleoptera:
26 Chrysomelidae) on different north american populations of purple loosestrife.
27 *Environ. Entomol.* 26, 439-445.
- 28 Bennett, P., Vanstaden, J., 1986. Gall formation in crofton weed, *Eupatorium*
29 *adenophorum* Spreng (syn *Ageratina adenophora*), by the *Eupatorium* Gall fly
30 *Procecidochares utilis* Stone (Diptera, Trypetidae). *Aust. J. Bot.* 34, 473-480.
- 31 Bess, H.A., Haramoto, F.H., 1972. Biological control of pamakani, *Eupatorium*
32 *adenophorum*, in Hawaii by a tephritid gall fly, *Procecidochares utilis*. 3. Status
33 of the weed, fly and parasites of the fly in 1966-71 versus 1950-57. *Proc. Hawaii.*
34 *Entomol. Soc.* 21,165-178

- 1 Bradshaw, C.J., Leroy, B., Bellard, C., Roiz, D., Albert, C., Fournier, A., Barbet-
2 Massin, M., Salles, J.-M., Simard, F., Courchamp, F., 2016. Massive yet grossly
3 underestimated global costs of invasive insects. *Nat. Commun* 7, 12986
- 4 Buccellato, L., Byrne, M., Witkowski, E., 2012. Interactions between a stem gall fly
5 and a leaf-spot pathogen in the biological control of *Ageratina adenophora*. *Biol.*
6 *Control* 61, 222-229.
- 7 Buccellato, L., Byrne, M.J., Fisher, J.T., Witkowski, E.T., 2019. Post-release
8 evaluation of a combination of biocontrol agents on Crofton weed: testing
9 extrapolation of greenhouse results to field conditions. *BioControl* 64, 457-468.
- 10 Butchart, S.H.M., Walpole, M., Collen, B., van Strien, A., Scharlemann, J.P.W.,
11 Almond, R.E.A., Baillie, J.E.M., Bomhard, B., Brown, C., Bruno, J., Carpenter,
12 K.E., Carr, G.M., Chanson, J., Chenery, A.M., Csirke, J., Davidson, N.C.,
13 Dentener, F., Foster, M., Galli, A., Galloway, J.N., Genovesi, P., Gregory, R.D.,
14 Hockings, M., Kapos, V., Lamarque, J.-F., Leverington, F., Loh, J., McGeoch,
15 M.A., McRae, L., Minasyan, A., Morcillo, M.H., Oldfield, T.E.E., Pauly, D.,
16 Quader, S., Revenga, C., Sauer, J.R., Skolnik, B., Spear, D., Stanwell-Smith, D.,
17 Stuart, S.N., Symes, A., Tierney, M., Tyrrell, T.D., Vié, J.-C., Watson, R., 2010.
18 *Global Biodiversity: Indicators of Recent Declines*. *Science* 328, 1164-1168.
- 19 Carroll, S.P., 2011. Conciliation biology: the eco-evolutionary management of
20 permanently invaded biotic systems. *Evol. Appl.* 4, 184-199.
- 21 Chen, S.G., Dai, X.B., Qiang, S., Tang, Y., 2005. Effect of a nonhost-selective toxin
22 from *Alternaria alternata* on chloroplast-electron transfer activity in *Eupatorium*
23 *adenophorum*. *Plant Pathol.* 54, 671-677.
- 24 Crawley, M.J. 1983. *Herbivory: The Dynamics of Animal-Plant Interactions*.
25 Berkeley, University of California Press. 437 pp.
- 26 Dang, W., Gao, X., Wang, J., Li, A., 2008. Soil seed bank traits in an area invaded by
27 *Eupatorium adenophorum*. *Biodivers. Sci.* 16, 126-132.
- 28 Datta, A., Kühn, I., Ahmad, M., Michalski, S., Auge, H., 2017. Processes affecting
29 altitudinal distribution of invasive *Ageratina adenophora* in western Himalaya:
30 The role of local adaptation and the importance of different life-cycle stages.
31 *PloS one* 12(1): e0187708.
- 32 Erasmus, D., Bennett, P., Staden, J.v., 1992. The effect of galls induced by the gall fly
33 *Procecidochares utilis* on vegetative growth and reproductive potential of
34 crofton weed, *Ageratina adenophora*. *Ann. Appl. Biol.* 120, 173-181.
- 35 Feng, Y.L., 2008a. Nitrogen allocation and partitioning in invasive and native
36 *Eupatorium* species. *Physiol. Plant.* 132, 350-358.
- 37 Feng, Y.L., 2008b. Photosynthesis, nitrogen allocation and specific leaf area in
38 invasive *Eupatorium adenophorum* and native *Eupatorium japonicum* grown at
39 different irradiances. *Physiol. Plant.* 133, 318-326.
- 40 Feng, Y.L., Li, Y.P., Wang, R.F., Callaway, R.M., Valiente-Banuet, A., 2011. A
41 quicker return energy-use strategy by populations of a subtropical invader in the
42 non-native range: a potential mechanism for the evolution of increased
43 competitive ability. *J. Ecol.* 99, 1116-1123.
- 44 Fournier, A., Penone, C., Pennino, M.G., Courchamp, F., 2019. Predicting future
45 invaders and future invasions. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* 116, 7905-7910.
- 46 Gao, X., Zhao, Y., Yang, X., Sun, S., 2013. Linking trait differences to community
47 dynamics: evidence from *Eupatorium adenophorum* and co-occurring native
48 species during a three-year succession. *PloS one* 8: e50247.
- 49 Garcia, L.C., Eubanks, M.D., 2019. Overcompensation for insect herbivory: a review
50 and meta-analysis of the evidence. *Ecology* 100, e02585.

- 1 Gong, B., Zhang, G., 2014. Interactions between plants and herbivores: A review of
2 plant defense. *Acta Ecol. Sin.* 34, 325-336.
- 3 Heystek, F., Wood, A., Naser, S., Kistensamy, Y., 2011. Biological control of two
4 *Ageratina* species (Asteraceae: Eupatorieae) in South Africa. *Afr. Entomol.* 19,
5 208-216.
- 6 Hulme, P.E., 2006. Beyond control: wider implications for the management of
7 biological invasions. *J. Appl. Ecol.* 43, 835-847.
- 8 Keane, R.M., Crawley, M.J., 2002. Exotic plant invasions and the enemy release
9 hypothesis. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* 17, 164-170.
- 10 Langa, S.D.F., Hill, M.P., Compton, S.G., 2020. Agents sans frontières: cross-border
11 aquatic weed biological control in the rivers of southern Mozambique. *Afr. J.*
12 *Aquat. Sci.*, 1749551; doi: 10.2989/16085914.
- 13 Lei, Y.B., Feng, Y.L., Zheng, Y.L., Wang, R.F., De Gong, H., Zhang, Y.P., 2011.
14 Innate and evolutionarily increased advantages of invasive *Eupatorium*
15 *adenophorum* over native *E. japonicum* under ambient and doubled atmospheric
16 CO₂ concentrations. *Biol. Invasions* 13, 2703-2714.
- 17 Liao, H., Gurgel, P.C., Pal, R.W., Hooper, D., Callaway, R.M., 2016. *Solidago*
18 *gigantea* plants from nonnative ranges compensate more in response to damage
19 than plants from the native range. *Ecology* 97, 2355-2363.
- 20 Lu, Z., Ma, K., 2006. Spread of the exotic croftonweed (*Eupatorium adenophorum*)
21 across southwest China along roads and streams. *Weed Sci.* 54, 1068-1072.
- 22 Luo, X. L., W. Y. Chen, T. G. Zhou and X. M. GuO. 2006. Zi jin ze lan zong he zhi li
23 ji shu. *Sichuan Agric. Sci. Technol.* 9, 36-37 (in Chinese).
- 24 McNaughton, S., 1979. Grazing as an optimization process: grass-ungulate
25 relationships in the Serengeti. *Am. Nat.* 113, 691-703.
- 26 Messing, R.H., Wright, M.G., 2006. Biological control of invasive species: solution or
27 pollution? *Front. Ecol. Environ.* 4, 132-140.
- 28 Mitchell, C.E., Power, A.G., 2003. Release of invasive plants from fungal and viral
29 pathogens. *Nature* 421, 625-627.
- 30 Myers, J.H., Sarfraz, R.M., 2017. Impacts of insect herbivores on plant populations.
31 *Annu. Rev. Entomol.* 62, 207-230.
- 32 Niu, Y., Feng, Y., Xie, J., Luo, F., 2010. Noxious invasive *Eupatorium adenophorum*
33 may be a moving target: Implications of the finding of a native natural enemy,
34 *Dorylus orientalis*. *Chin. Sci. Bull.* 55, 3743-3745.
- 35 Pearson, D.E., Ortega, Y.K., Eren, Ö., Hierro, J.L., 2018. Community assembly
36 theory as a framework for biological invasions. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* 33, 313-325.
- 37 Pejchar, L., Mooney, H.A., 2009. Invasive species, ecosystem services and human
38 well-being. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* 24, 497-504.
- 39 Sharma Poudel, A., Babu Shrestha, B., Kumar Jha, P., Bahadur Baniya, C.,
40 Muniappan, R., 2020. Stem galling of *Ageratina adenophora* (Asterales:
41 Asteraceae) by a biocontrol agent *Procecidochares utilis* (Diptera: Tephritidae)
42 is elevation dependent in central Nepal. *Biocontrol Sci. Technol.*, 1-17; doi:
43 10.1080/09583157.2020.1749991.
- 44 Pyšek, P., Jarošík, V., Hulme, P.E., Pergl, J., Hejda, M., Schaffner, U., Vilà, M.,
45 2012. A global assessment of invasive plant impacts on resident species,
46 communities and ecosystems: the interaction of impact measures, invading
47 species' traits and environment. *Global Change Biol.* 18, 1725-1737.
- 48 Qiang, S., Zhu, Y., Summerell, B., Li, Y., 2006. Mycelium of *Alternaria alternata* as
49 a potential biological control agent for *Eupatorium adenophorum*. *Biocontrol*
50 *Sci. Technol.* 16, 653-668.

- 1 Ramula, S., Paige, K.N., Lennartsson, T., Tuomi, J., 2019. Overcompensation: a 30-
2 year perspective. *Ecology* 100, e02667.
- 3 Rands, M.R., Adams, W.M., Bennun, L., Butchart, S.H., Clements, A., Coomes, D.,
4 Entwistle, A., Hodge, I., Kapos, V., Scharlemann, J.P., 2010. Biodiversity
5 conservation: challenges beyond 2010. *science* 329, 1298-1303.
- 6 Reese, A.T., Ames, G.M., Wright, J.P., 2016. Variation in plant response to herbivory
7 underscored by functional traits. *PloS one* 11(12): e0166714.
- 8 Rosenberg, M.S., Adams, D.C., Gurevitch, J., 2000. MetaWin: statistical software for
9 meta-analysis version 2.0.
- 10 Rosenthal, J., Kotanen, P., 1994. Terrestrial plant tolerance to herbivory. *Trends Ecol.*
11 *Evol.* 9, 145-148.
- 12 Russell-Mercier, J.L., Sargent, R.D., 2015. Indirect effects of herbivory on plant–
13 pollinator interactions in invasive *Lythrum salicaria*. *Am. J. Bot.* 102, 661-668.
- 14 Sang, W., Zhu, L., Axmacher, J.C., 2010. Invasion pattern of *Eupatorium*
15 *adenophorum* Spreng in southern China. *Biol. Invasions* 12, 1721-1730.
- 16 Shea, K., Possingham, H.P., 2000. Optimal release strategies for biological control
17 agents: an application of stochastic dynamic programming to population
18 management. *J. Appl. Ecol.* 37, 77-86.
- 19 Simberloff, D., Martin, J.-L., Genovesi, P., Maris, V., Wardle, D.A., Aronson, J.,
20 Courchamp, F., Galil, B., García-Berthou, E., Pascal, M., 2013. Impacts of
21 biological invasions: what's what and the way forward. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* 28,
22 58-66.
- 23 Sun, X., Lu, Z., Sang, W., 2004. Review on studies of *Eupatorium adenophorum*
24 important invasive species in China. *J. For.Res.* 15, 319-322.
- 25 Sun, X., Lu, Z., Yu, X., Sang, W., 2005. Age structure dynamics of *Eupatorium*
26 *adenophorum* populations and its implications for control. *Chin J Plan Ecolo.*,
27 29, 373-379 (in Chinese).
- 28 Tabassum, S., Leishman, M.R., 2018. Have your cake and eat it too: greater dispersal
29 ability and faster germination towards range edges of an invasive plant species in
30 eastern Australia. *Biol. Invasions* 20, 1199-1210.
- 31 R Development Core Team , 2013. R: A language and environment for statistical
32 computing.
- 33 Thomsen, C.J., Sargent, R.D., 2017. Evidence that a herbivore tolerance response
34 affects selection on floral traits and inflorescence architecture in purple
35 loosestrife (*Lythrum salicaria*). *Ann. Bot.* 119, 1295-1303.
- 36 Van Staden, J., Bennett, P., 1991a. Effect of galling on assimilate partitioning in
37 crofton weed(*Ageratina adenophora*). *S. Afr. J. Bot.* 57, 128-130.
- 38 Van Staden, J., Bennett, P., 1991b. Gall formation in crofton weed. Differences
39 between normal stem tissue and gall tissue with respect to cytokinin levels and
40 requirements for in vitro culture. *S. Afr. J. Bot.* 57, 246-248.
- 41 Van Wilgen, B., Moran, V., Hoffmann, J., 2013. Some perspectives on the risks and
42 benefits of biological control of invasive alien plants in the management of
43 natural ecosystems. *Environ. Manage.* 52, 531-540.
- 44 Vilà, M., Espinar, J.L., Hejda, M., Hulme, P.E., Jarošík, V., Maron, J.L., Pergl, J.,
45 Schaffner, U., Sun, Y., Pyšek, P., 2011. Ecological impacts of invasive alien
46 plants: a meta-analysis of their effects on species, communities and ecosystems.
47 *Ecol. Lett.* 14, 702-708.
- 48 Wan, F., Liu, W., Guo, J., Qiang, S., Li, B., Wang, J., Yang, G., Niu, H., Gui, F.,
49 Huang, W., 2010. Invasive mechanism and control strategy of *Ageratina*
50 *adenophora* (Sprengel). *Sci. China Life Sci.* 53, 1291-1298.

- 1 Wan, Z., Zhu, J., Qiang, S., 2001. The pathogenic mechanism of toxin of *Alternaria*
2 *alternata* (Fr.) Keissler to *Eupatorium adenophorum* Spreng. J. Plant Resour.
3 Environ 10, 47-50 (in Chinese).
- 4 Wang, W.-B., Wang, R.-F., Lei, Y.-B., Liu, C., Han, L.-H., Shi, X.-D., Feng, Y.-L.,
5 2013. High resource capture and use efficiency and prolonged growth season
6 contribute to invasiveness of *Eupatorium adenophorum*. Plant Ecol. 214, 857-
7 868.
- 8 Wang, W., Wang, J., Zhao, Z., 2006. Seed population dynamics and germination
9 characteristics of *Eupatorium adenophorum*. J. Appl. Ecol. 17, 982-986 (in
10 Chinese).
- 11 Wilcove, D.S., Rothstein, D., Dubow, J., Phillips, A., Losos, E., 1998. Quantifying
12 threats to imperiled species in the United States. Bioscience 48, 607-615.
- 13 Wise, M.J., Abrahamson, W.G., 2005. Beyond the compensatory continuum:
14 environmental resource levels and plant tolerance of herbivory. Oikos 109, 417-
15 428.
- 16 Yang, R. X. and C. H. Lei. 1996. Zi jin ze lan fen bu ji wei hai diao yan bao gao.
17 Panzihua Sci-Tech Info. 3, 21-26 (in Chinese).
- 18 Zavaleta, E.S., Hobbs, R.J., Mooney, H.A., 2001. Viewing invasive species removal
19 in a whole-ecosystem context. Trends Ecol. Evol. 16, 454-459.
- 20 Zhang, F., Liu, W., Wan, F., Ellison, C., Julien, M., Sforza, R., Bon, M., Evans, H.,
21 Hatcher, P., Hinz, H., 2008. Sustainable management based on biological control
22 and ecological restoration of an alien invasive weed, *Ageratina adenophora*
23 (Asteraceae) in China. Proceedings of the XII International Symposium on
24 Biological Control of Weeds. CABI Wallingford, UK, pp. 699-703.
- 25 Zheng, Y.-L., Feng, Y.-L., Lei, Y.-B., Liao, Z.-Y., 2012. Comparisons of plastic
26 responses to irradiance and physiological traits by invasive *Eupatorium*
27 *adenophorum* and its native congeners. J. Plant Physiol. 169, 884-891.
- 28 Zhu, L., Sang, W., 2008. Effects of defoliation on competitive interactions between
29 invasive crofton weed (*Eupatorium adenophorum*) and its native neighbors:
30 implication for biocontrol. Weed Sci. 56, 112-118.
- 31
32

1 **FIGURE LEGENDS**

2 **Fig. 1** The abundance of *Procecidochares utilis* galls in four populations of *Ageratina*
3 *adenophora*. Open bars indicate the proportion of plots with galls and solid bars
4 indicate the proportion of stems with galls. The sample sizes are provided above the
5 bars. HY, MN, XC and PD represent the sampled populations, i.e Hanyuan County,
6 Mianning County, Xichang City and Pindi Town.

7

8

9 **Fig. 2** The percentage of branched *Ageratina adenophora* stems. Significant
10 differences are indicated by different letters on the bars (based on Chi square tests of
11 frequencies). The stem sample sizes are the same as in Fig. 1.

12

13

14 **Fig. 3** The extent of overcompensation in response to galling in terms of summed side
15 branch lengths and side branch numbers. Sample sizes for the two measures were the
16 same and are in parentheses (numbers of ungalled stems, numbers of galled stems).

17